THE EXAMINER.

No. 577. SUNDAY, JAN. 17, 1819.

THE POLITICAL EXAMINER.

Party is the madness of many for the gain of a few. POPE.

No. 562.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH'S WILL.

THERE is a clause in this document, which has induced us to say a few more words respecting the Learned and Noble Writer. When the casual reader sees to what we allude, he will be apt to think that we advert to the clause out of a spirit of hostility or personal resentment. The habitual reader, we are sure, will have a different opinion. We can be hostile enough against enemies that are worth contending with; but we will venture to say, that our hostility, let it have been as warm as it may, has carried with it more openness and hazard, and been less grounded on personal matters, than any we have ever met with in return; and for revenge, properly speaking, we have an infinite contempt. We hold it to be but a worse kind of fierce boys'-play,—the wreaking of weak personal impatience,—the acknowledged soreness of wounded egotism,—or at best, an absurd effort to obtain justice, by means which must perpetuate every species of wrong. We say then once for all, that we have no resentment whatsoever against Lord ELLENBOROUGH, though we suspect that his ill-temper and courtliness aggravated the weight of our punishment, when the adulation of the *Morning Post* provoked us into that tirade against a foolish man. Nor do we wish to insinuate any thing flattering of ourselves in disclaiming such feelings. The feelings which always enabled us to despise them, led us at last into a train of thinking which carried us away from the common notions of merit and demerit; and if we think that early circumstances apparently less favourable, and an ultimate condition of life apparently much inferior to that of the most exalted worldly man, have made us happier and more at our real ease than he, it is all the superiority we would ever claim, and contains the ground of all the morals we ever wish to inculcate.

The fact is, that on the present occasion we are going to praise, as well as to pity, Lord ELLENBOROUGH; and when the subject of our praise is seen, we suppose that all the hypocrites who objected to us for not praising him for his faults while living, will cry out against us for doing justice to what we found good in him when dead. But our writings have always a much greater object in view, than any thing personal, whether of praise or blame; and we look upon the following little item in a will, as suggesting reflections, that go a great way beyond those of mere idleness and curiosity:—

"Item," says the Noble and Learned Judge, after making proper mention of his wife and his eldest son, and before he speaks of his other children,—"Item, I give to my dear natural daughter, Miss ELIZABETH THORNTON, 2000*l.* with interest, from my death, to the time of payment."

Now we like this. We said in our last number, that Lord ELLENBOROUGH had not to reckon hypocrisy among his faults; and this proves it. He was worldly enough, and the rest of his will goes to prove that also; for his great object seems to have been to aggrandize himself and family. In other words, as we observed before, he had a false and bad opinion of human nature, and thought it was nothing but a business of "Get who can." But this touch of natural affection redeems it. It shews of what elements he was made, and to what purpose they might have been turned, in common with those of all mankind. We do not allude to the fact of his having had a natural child. That may have been a very "venial" or a very vicious thing,—like the adultery of which he spoke. Neither do we know, nor is it our business to know, any thing respecting the young lady herself; except that she stands a chance of being a sprightlier and healthier human being, than thousands who will fancy themselves her betters. It is the mention of her, that we like. The Noble and Learned Lord has toiled through a great deal of worldliness, virtuous as well as vicious: he had earned too much by it, to give it up: his seals, and crests, and peer's robes, evidently glittered about him to the last, and hung their gaudy colours in the clouds that were gathering on his grave;—but it was a sorry and trite business after all:—it had given him little pleasure; it was about to give him none; his nature resolved itself into the elements that first composed it, before it had been made altogether artificial and uncomfortable by a crust of common-place ambition and courtliness; and in an hour, when the sullenness of disappointment, and the shame of confessing it, may have given way before the weakening of disease, one can almost imagine that he shed tears of mingled remorse and sweetness, in writing that memorial of his "*dear* natural daughter, ELIZABETH THORNTON."

"Oh yes!" some sly rogues will exclaim; "very sweet and remorseful indeed," and then they will shrug their shoulders, and wink at each other. Much of this kind of comment will take place privately at court and in the government-offices. Others will affirm that it was nothing but sheer impudence in a Judge to mention his natural daughter in that manner. And the grave hypocrites, together with such of the sly rogues above mentioned as profess principle before strangers, will affect publicly to lament it. They will think at least that "it had better been left alone."—"Human nature is frail no doubt,—even in the most exalted stations; and it is right to be candid,—extremely right to be candid; but for the sake of example, such candour should be avoided." So saying, they take their several ways to their mistresses, their bottles, their bigotries, their hypocrisies, their indigestions, their slaveries, their tyrannies, their peculations, and their pluralities.

Still we cannot but refresh ourselves with this little effusion of humanity on the part of the Noble Judge; not because we catch him napping, as the phrase is; for we might have told of such things before, on many occasions;

neither have we any natural children of our own, to make us set value on such an authority, if we thought it one; but because, as we have already said, this is a proof of some genuine feeling on the part of his Lordship; because, it is noble to see how a parents' love for a child, begotten under an unequivocal impulse, becomes a finer thing at last, even with it's association of error, than all the ordinary *worldly* notions of virtue; and because, if it was right in the poet to say that

God made the country and man made the town,

it is at least as certain that Nature made natural children, while Law would have us imply that it makes them unnatural. Let us not be misunderstood. We do not mean to say, that all the young gentlemen and ladies who may read this paper, are to begin playing the Abelard and Eloisa. We only mean, that a natural affection survives, let it have originated how it may; and that although custom may make an action vicious, and so very often produce real guilt out of artificial, it may also make artificial virtues and modes of prosperity, which are after all not worth two-pence in the comparison.

What is the deduction then? It is this;—that society, aye even by it's own confession, does not produce happiness, as it is now constituted; and that all movements of natural affection ought to be watched, in order to see how far a reference to the elements of our being may improve it, and virtue be brought to make custom, not custom virtue. Profligate persons will undoubtedly take advantage of all changes in theory; but what infinite advantages do they not take already of things established, turning all the bigoted forms of society into one mass of selfishness and unhappiness, and making virtue consist in the most arrant worldly-mindedness both here and hereafter? If charity and not selfishness,—that is to say, if a real and not a false notion of self-interest, and of the mutual reflection of general benevolence,—were to new-model the forms of society, vice and not virtue would become the *exception*, because artificial guilt would be done away with; and the old and absurd notions of the difficulty of virtue vanish with the return of it's pleasantness. "If all the world," says PLATO, "could see virtue *in her own likeness*, they would fall in love with it." "Aye," say those, who call, and make, this beautiful world *a vale of tears*,—he meant our virtue, only you can't see it."—Why, truly, gentlemen, one's eyes are apt to be a little dim that way, and to mistake your charmer for a selfish old harridan; but you will see your own mistake, if you will look in PLATO himself.

To return to Lord ELLENBOROUGH. What is the deduction with regard to *him?* Is it this,—that he ought certainly not to have been a Judge, and that the contradiction between his official theories and his practice accounts for his behaviour as one. Observe—he had a natural child, loved her, and made particular mention of her in his will. Now he must either have thought it wrong or not wrong to have had such a child:—if he thought it wrong, he did not let the world into his opinion, and nevertheless he undertook to be a judge over others:—if he thought it right, he must have repeatedly let it be supposed that he thought otherwise:—and whether he thought it right or wrong, what became of his example, seeing that the laws and opinions which he maintained are what they are? The upshot is, that he thought vice and virtue, and the judicial business to boot, to be what is called a *hum*; and this, with men of his general tendency, is the natural consequence of those eternal inconsistencies between practice and theory, which the predominance of false opinion produces. With others, the dreary labour of false virtue is substituted for the pleasant easiness of true;—despondency succeeds instead of hope;—then comes faith as a substitute for practice;—and then, by an inevitable succession, comes every species of artificial and real guilt, fraud, hypocrisy, and selfishness; and *hopelessness*, in some shape or other, ruins the world.

But hope and practice are at last dawning together.

☞

MR. COBBETT DEFENDED.

I will have my bond.———SHAKSPEARE.

MR. EXAMINER,—As your paper has been made the vehicle of a violent and combined attack, not on the political principles, but on the moral character of Mr. Cobbett, by the insertion of an address to the Electors of Westminster, signed "A Reformer," surely you are bound, in fairness and equity, to admit also a calm and disinterested defence of the person thus publicly criminated. Had the subject been one in which you are personally concerned, as the Editor of a public journal, with Mr. Cobbett, also in possession of similar means of communication, the contest ought, perhaps, to be left to yourselves, notwithstanding the serious inequality created between you by the great distance of one party, and the presence, on the spot, of the other. But this is not the case; *you* are not personally implicated; and the defence of the accused, till he can speak for himself, ought to be conveyed to the world through the channel of your highly interesting journal, which the accuser has employed to publish his charge.

I am almost afraid, Sir, that you will deem it a reproach, a tacit suspicion of your impartiality, and an ill compliment to your candour, thus to urge reasons to persuade you to a mere act of ordinary justice. Let this feeling, however, be decidedly repelled. There is no public journalist to whom I could make this application with a confidence equal to that by which I am actuated in appealing to your liberality. The motive which induces me to argue a point so clear applies to your readers, with whom it may be desirable that you should stand fair, so to say, and with whom I wish to stand fair myself.

It can not be justly objected that the defence of Mr. Cobbett, now forwarded to you for publication, is anonymous. The charge was equally anonymous. If, however, it should be still alleged that the author of that charge is known to *you* under his real name, which he may have furnished by private communication, I have removed that plea by putting you in possession also of *my* true designation. This, at the same time, Sir, I must premise, that, as I make no inquiry after the "Reformer's" appellation, you will leave me precisely in the same state, holding in *your own* custody mine, which I will not have unnecessarily scattered among the people, and not until I have reason to know that the same measure is meted out to the impugner of Mr. Cobbett, which, if I understand any thing of the proper conduct of *gentlemen*, ought not to be without the consent of *both parties*.

To justify, if justification be necessary, my own voluntary services in favour of an absent person calumniated, I might produce various general reasons, and even claim a preference over the "Reformer," in public estimation, on the ground that to defend even the guilty, and much more the innocent, is a more generous and honourable function than to act the part of accuser of the innocent or guilty.

But I prefer calling your attention to a passage of Horace, sufficiently applicable to the present case, to the accuser and to the advocate, which is well worthy of the study of a Christian age:—*Absentem qui rodit amicum*, says he,—he who malignant tears an absent friend,—which I leave to be applied by those whom it describes. He adds, *qui non defendit alio culpante*,—or when attacked by others, dont defend;—which would apply, in a qualified sense, to your present correspondent, should he not attempt to parry the thrust which has been made at the moral character of Mr. Cobbett in his absence. I say, in a *qualified* sense, for I have no friendship with Mr. Cobbett, having never seen him *on any occasion*, which averment *you* will fully credit. Still *friend* Cobbett, when injured, must not be deserted. He is the friend of liberty and reform; he is, Sir, as I sincerely believe, "to virtue and her friends a friend," although he, like most others, is not incapable of error. He is my friend on higher ground than personal intimacy, for he is the friend of man. After this, permit me to transcribe the whole passage of Horace, with Francis's translation:—

——— Absentem qui rodit amicum,
Qui non defendit alio culpante; solutos
Qui captat risus hominum, famamque dicacis;
Fingere qui non visa potest; commissa tacere
Qui nequit; *hic niger est; hunc tu, Romane, caveto.*

He, who malignant tears an absent friend,
Or, when attacked by others, dont defend;
Who trivial bursts of laughter strives to raise,
And courts of prating petulance the praise;
Of things he never saw who tells his tale,
And friendship's secrets knows not to conceal;
This man is vile; here, Roman, fix your mark;
His soul is black, as his complexion's dark.

To come at last to my more immediate subject:—Towards the conclusion of Mr. Cobbett's Letter X. to Major Cartwright, dated Oct. 10, 1818, he writes,—"I hear that there is an *Unitarian Priest*, at Liverpool, who is very busy in telling what he has been shown (as he says) *by Brookes*. It is, he says, *a letter from the Baronet to me, in answer to one from me to him*, touching *a debt I owe him*. What a *refined mode of spreading calumny!* To a man of common mind it would have occurred, that the natural way was to write *to me*, and send me *the letter*; and, *if publicity were right and proper*, to publish *my letter along with the answer*. But, to a man of such excessive *purity*, it occurred, that the best way was to write an answer, and to deposit it at the back-biting shop in the Strand, to be read without the thing to which it pretended to be an answer. Verily this is become a most foolish, as well as a most mean and malignant man;—all which, if I do not *prove*, let me pass for the vile man that I declare him to be. In the meanwhile, I hereby call upon him *to publish my letter to him with its inclosure*, which inclosure is a copy of a letter from me to Mr. Tipper."

This call of Mr. Cobbett appears to be the impulse which induced the publication of the letters contained in the "Reformer's" address to the Electors of Westminster.

Now, of this call, Sir, the Baronet has no right whatever to avail himself, as will be proved by the following reasons:—

1. The Baronet, or which is the same thing, the "Reformer," *has not* availed himself of it. To all the readers of the *Examiner*, who had not read *Cobbett's Register* of the 20th December, the publication of these letters must have appeared *spontaneous* on the part of Sir F. Burdett. What the feelings of honourable men must have been will be easily guessed, when I come to remark on the publication itself of this *private correspondence*. The reason why the call of Mr. Cobbett was not alleged is obvious; the tenor of it was dreaded, and it was thought most expedient not to send the public to *Cobbett's Register* to form an acquaintance with it. Indeed, the whole of Letter X. to Major Cartwright, was such *a tight thing for our forging enemies*, which is Mr. Cobbett's own expression, that the veil of obscurity was studiously thrown over it. Be this, however, as it may, Sir Francis has *not* availed himself of Mr. Cobbett's call, by producing it as his justification for divulging and publishing a *private correspondence*; and that of which he has not availed himself *shall* not avail him. On which account, I shall treat the publication of *this private correspondence* as the spontaneous act of the Baronet.

2. Had Sir Francis availed himself of this call, he had no right to do so. Your readers should know what they probably have not heard, that these letters had been widely divulged *before* Mr. Cobbett's call had made its appearance. That call, therefore, is a sorry pretext for the publication of a *private correspondence*, which *publication* had preceded the call, if it were even true that publication by *printing* was posterior to it.

3. It is *not* true that the most material part of this *private correspondence* was divulged by printing subsequently to the call in *Cobbett's Register*. If I am not misinformed, Mr. Examiner, Sir Francis's answer to Mr. Cobbett, an answer quite supererogatory, had been, previously to Mr. Cobbett's call, published in a Liverpool paper, but whether with or without the other *private* correspondence, "this deponent sayeth not." This being so, this must be considered as a *private correspondence voluntarily divulged* by Sir Francis Burdett.

4. Besides, it must be very particularly observed by the reader, that the call of Mr. Cobbett extended merely *to his letter, and a letter inclosed, addressed to Mr. Tipper*. It does not appear that the Baronet's gratuitous answer has ever been sent to Mr. Cobbett. It was not received on the 10th of October last, according to the statement in the Letter X. to Major Cartwright of that date. Indeed, a conditional liberty is given for its eventual publication while yet unseen, and the condition is, that it should be attended with the answer, and *if publicity were right and proper*. And *this* is mentioned as the *proper way*, that is, comparatively proper, preferable to the disingenuous mode adopted, of divulging clandestinely a *private correspondence* as a refined mode of spreading calumny. At the same time, Mr. Cobbett's real call on the Baronet to publish, is *not* to publish *this* letter, which he had not seen, but to publish his letter to Sir Francis, and its enclosure, a letter to Mr. Tipper. I therefore pronounce that the Baronet has published a *private correspondence*, as far as this letter is concerned, without legitimate authority.

5. I remark, with no ordinary emphasis, that the call of Mr. Cobbett, whether more or less limited, was the effect of an injury previously committed by the clandestine circulation of a part at least of this *private correspondence*. Every honourable man will pronounce that a call, under such circumstances, could warrant nothing of this kind, and least of all warrant an aggravation of the injury already done. A very different conduct was required by this call from a man of the least elevation of sentiment, which I will state under a distinct head.

6. Sir Francis Burdett, instead of obeying the call of Mr. Cobbett for a small reparation of a great injury, ought to have done him complete justice, by humbling himself before him, in deep contrition, and asking forgiveness for his offence already perpetrated. This the Baronet has not done; and he does not appear to have a mind of sufficient dignity to perform this most difficult, though the most essential duty of man to man, *to repair an injury and make atonement for wrong*. Sir Francis Burdett has only added to his former delinquency, by an accumulation of offence, in giving *further* extension to his ungenerous conduct, and in accompanying it in a public print with the criminatory observations of the "Reformer."

For these reasons, I come now to comment on this publication as a voluntary promulgation, on the part of the Baronet, of a *private correspondence*, on a subject of the most delicate nature, a private *obligation*, as the "Reformer" calls pecuniary accommodation, on legal interest, in this *monied* country. Before I go on, I will remark, that it has been ever held, by honourable men, that the moment an obligation, a *real* obligation, comes to be reproached, the vulgar word is, *twitted*, by the *obliger*, the obligation is at once cancelled. This does not refer to *debt*, but to *obligation*. Sir Francis, by the "Reformer," having thus *twitted* Mr. Cobbett of obligation has completely set him free as to *obligation*, whatever may be its amount. This common maxim is founded on the justest principle; for the person obliged suffers in feeling, by the *twitting*, more than all the *obligation* is worth; and no man is bound to repay both in person and in purse what he has *overpaid* in person, and is ready to pay fully in purse, so far as purse is concerned.

This being settled, I come to the *letters*. I am bound to condemn the publication of this *private correspondence* in the most unqualified terms. The reasons which I have stated prove it to be entirely voluntary on the Baronet's part, and a forced call on the part of Mr. Cobbett makes no difference, as the letters, or one of them, had been already published, and the partial and conditional call was merely in order to obtain some reparation for an injury committed, while a very different and more satisfactory reparation alone could be deemed sufficient. This practice of divulging *private correspondence* was begun at the Westminster Election. I do not allude to the communication, at that time, of *this* correspondence to the *Unitarian Priest*, and probably to others: I allude to the production, unprovoked, if any thing can provoke so foul a deed, of a *private letter*, as acknowledged, of a supposed private letter, of the same gentleman, at that election; of a letter which all parties now *know* to be a *forgery*, though it is still publicly shown. It is impossible to express the indignation which ought to be felt towards a conduct so *intrinsically*, so *purely*, so *unmixedly base*. In the present case also,—in an address to the Electors of Westminster,—there was not a shadow of justification, if indeed *any* justification can be set up for a thing so essentially mean and dishonourable. The shuffling reason given, either for making public Mr. Cobbett's letters to Mr. Tipper and Sir Francis Burdett, or for attacking more generally the character of Mr. Cobbett, viz. "because it is most probable that he will attack Mr. Hobhouse," is so shameful, that I would almost burn my fingers for having transcribed it. It is unexampled in the history of men claiming in society the rank or name of gentlemen. Attack! Pray when? On this subject *words* are unnecessary. Every generous feeling of every generous mind at once revolts at such a subterfuge to cover malignity, which is too much honoured by applying to it any epithet.

It is impossible not to remark also on the publication of the Baronet's *answer* to Mr. Cobbett. I consider it particularly *unjustifiable* for the reasons already given, and totally *unjustified* by the reason alleged, "because it is most likely that Mr. Cobbett will attack Mr. Hobhouse," a reason which I am in fairness allowed to apply to the *whole* publication in your journal. Of the *little man*, Mr. Hobhouse, I do not know much. I can only express my sorrow that Westminster could find no better representative. Prudence might have cautioned the "Reformer" not to throw him down to Mr. Cobbett, by an unnecessary intermixture with the Baronet, as a mouse to be devoured at a meal.

We are disposed to pass over a thousand errors and mistakes in Sir Francis Burdett, because he is, at least, a half friend, a qualified friend, of the people, which is saying something of a man in these corrupt times, though it is saying much less than we had a right to expect from the honourable Baronet. At one time, *he did not promise this*. But a foul action is not to be glossed over, out of tenderness to far greater merit. We cannot mince the matter. A base action is not to be pardoned because it happens to be perpetrated by a person whose fortune and popularity, however acquired, would, with respect to him, "cover a multitude of other sins." Such a gross outrage on gentlemanly manners, and offence to the decencies and equities of society, are only aggravated by his rank and by his estimation with the public, and call for exemplary and commensurate castigation. To introduce and perpetuate systems of despotism, they must necessarily be commenced, they must be sanctioned by, popular Monarchs. In like manner, social intercourse, among the middling or lower ranks of society, who are the Baronet's support, cannot easily be depraved but by the patronage and example of generally estimable characters, whose feeling or whose folly may contribute to that depravation. Is it to be endured, Sir, that Sir *Francis Burdett* should make such an inroad on the sanctity of *private confidence*? But I am afraid to proceed, lest my feelings should give an undue energy to my expressions; and I restrain myself, in pity to an erring friend of *something like reform*, and because no comment can add colour and effect to the statement of the simple fact, that Sir Francis Burdett's private correspondence has, *by himself*, been made public; that the letters of Mr. Cobbett, on private business with two individuals, have made their appearance in your publication, by his constrained and misinterpreted consent, as the least of two evils.

But I must say something to the *contents* of the letters which you have been induced to print as a part of the address of the "Reformer" to the electors of Westminster.

On reading these letters, thus divulged, a thought naturally suggests itself, that there must have been some cause to induce Mr. Cobbett *to write* those to Mr. Tipper and to Sir Francis Burdett, on which the latter has so coldly and severely animadverted. What was it that extorted from him this declaration of his principles? Had he, in his exile, been harassed with demands! If this was the fact, must not a burst of indignation break from every generous heart? Was a confiscation of his property threatened? Probably we must wait for the appearance of *Mr.* William Cobbett's own account of this affair, for satisfaction. This fact, if it be one, is essential to a true estimate of the merit of this correspondence, so basely divulged. In the mean time, this suspicion, so naturally suggested, is corroborated by Mr. Cobbett's words to Major Cartwright, Letter X. "I was hardly on ship-board," says he, "as I have since found (but which I did not find for months afterwards), when he (Sir Francis) began to cause to be circulated through all the newspapers, that the *real cause* of my going away was my *debts*, and, in part *my debts to him!* I *know* this for fact; and, I promise the public, both in America and in England, a full and true account of the whole matter." If this was *one* of the causes of Mr. Cobbett's expatriation, it would appear that he must have been in danger of arrest or litigation; and is it unjust to suppose that, when he was safe from personal molestation, he was pursued by no very gentle demands? If a true cause has been assigned here for Mr. Cobbett's going away, this is the inference. If it be a false one, the same inference equally follows, together with another which is left to the reader to deduce.

There may be some difference of opinion respecting the soundness of the moral axiom advanced by Mr. Cobbett, on his duty concerning the payment of his debts, in the extraordinary circumstances of his case. I might possibly disagree with him myself, if I could be induced to take the subject into minute consideration. Yet, I could not permit myself roundly to condemn the principle as demonstrably false on the first blush; much less could I set down

Mr. Cobbett as unprincipled and profligate for drawing a different conclusion from mine, on a subject of no common difficulty. I should be long in pronouncing that it is a duty, in all cases, to pay the nominal amount of debt; such, for instance, as that contracted at this period of unprecedented depreciation of what is called money; its nominal account cannot, in equity, be demanded at that future period, so probable, when the Bank of England shall have met its fate, and money shall have acquired three or four times its present value. At such a period, the fulfilment of contracts would be equally impossible and unjust. Legal enactment would become necessary, that contracts should be performed and debts discharged by payments *equivalent* to former engagements, and not *equal* in arithmetical amount. Mr. Cobbett's case may not be so strong and unequivocal as this now stated; yet it is strong, very strong, and cannot be dismissed, at once, as incapable of all rational support. It is not to be set down by a taunt; nay, the breast that has any sense of humanity must contemplate it with sincere commiseration. Dark, indeed, must be the heart of that man who should treat it with rudeness and scorn. If Mr. Cobbett errs, there is no need for seeking the cause of his error in dishonesty of design. The pressure of difficulty, and just indignation against enormous injury, operating on a mind incapable of feeling slightly on any subject, are sufficient to account for the false light, if it be false, in which Mr. Cobbett has viewed the subject.

But it is quite unnecessary to dwell upon a hypothetical principle, on which the assertor of it avows he has no design to act. Mr. Cobbett says, "I eagerly waive all claim to this principle, and I shall neglect no means within my power fully to pay and satisfy every demand, as far as that can be done consistently with that duty, which calls on me to take care that my family have the means of fairly exerting their industry, and of leading that sort of life to which they have a just claim." That is, "I have two duties to perform; if I can, I will perform both; if I cannot, I will perform that which appears to me of more absolute obligation." The judgment formed by Mr. Cobbett on the comparative obligation of the two duties may be disapproved. Yet every man, who owes money, forms a similar judgment and constantly acts on it, even in *ordinary* circumstances, with universal consent and approbation. No man has ever been required not to feed and clothe his children or to set them out in life, because he has contracted debts or till they are discharged. No man, on going into business with borrowed capital, is called upon neither to be fed or clothed *himself*, till he has replaced that capital. The only difference is, that Mr Cobbett fairly states this as a rule of his conduct, forced on him, mind, by the oppression of a profligate administration, unchecked by the country that owes protection to him and his property, which has been diminished by that oppression; while other men act upon the same principle, without avowal, but with the universal consent of men in all ages and countries. Perhaps, indeed, the latitude of discretion which Mr. Cobbett seems to claim may be denied him. For this denial there is little reason, because the same latitude, whether claimed or not, is granted to and taken by every person who is not free from debts. Besides, Mr. Cobbett has a good ground of demand on the public to give him credit that he will use the latitude he asserts with discretion and probity. What reason is there for thinking otherwise? Surely, the minute statements which he has given of his prospects, arising from literary productions, are a proof of the utmost anxiety to perform his engagements. Sir F. Burdett and he are at issue on the whole point. The latter says, "I will pay you; I will neglect no means to enable me to do so; but I will not starve my children; I will not, circumstanced as I am, utterly demolish them, and cause *them* also to feel the last efforts of that oppression by which I am nearly overwhelmed." The former replies, "You may do as you please; but, *if I have not my bond*, I shall consider your principles ridiculous and your conduct *detestable*. I could not help your aggravated misfortunes; your family is nothing to me; *give me my bond*."

This leads me to consider briefly *the Baronet's letter* to *Mr.* Wm. Cobbett. Every man, who allows himself a moment to examine this document, so disingenuously divulged, must observe the cool *begging of the question* uniformly running through this very carefully written epistle; and indeed the deliberate misstatement of the gist of the subject. Sir Francis takes it for granted that *Mr.* Wm. Cobbett's principle is utterly groundless, and even profligate and detestable, either without adverting once to circumstances, or by denying their admissibility. He assumes also, that his debtor means to act upon that principle, contrary to his express declaration. As this declaration rendered the whole of the Baronet's unfeeling comment irrelevant, that comment, and especially its severity, must be assigned to a frightful malignity, probably excited by the unmerciful castigation of Sir Francis's political conduct inflicted by the publications of his adversary. The Baronet's postulates can not be granted him till he has shewn the fallacy, in the circumstances, of the principle he ridicules, and the profligacy of the design, which Mr. Cobbett so expressly disavows. It was very easy to charge on his castigator the influence of self-love. It is not equally easy to obtain emancipation from its thraldom. If we wanted proof of this, and an example of the Baronet's vulgar proverb, that "Nature is her own Bawd," the letter in discussion would suffice. Here self-love and self-interest are in full authority, notwithstanding the easy permission of "do as you please." "Pay me my bond, whatever you and yours may suffer, or let it alone; do as you please; but if you do not, by hook and by crook, I know what I shall think of you; your conduct will be detestable." If Mr. Cobbett's maxims of conduct are reprehensible, this unfeeling demand of the uttermost farthing, for what is it else? is, in such a case, far more reprehensible, not to say detestable. Mr. Cobbett's error, when his spirit was sick and his heart was sore, when he was probably goaded and harassed by the demands of a rigorous creditor, might have excited sympathy; it never could have merited this cold reprobation. Talk of justice! Is justice all, and feeling nothing? They may be, in a money-loving age and in a money-loving country. But give me no such *moralists*. Sir, if I saw a fellow-creature ready to perish, and were going to pay my creditors the last shilling I could expect ever to possess, I would give that shilling to the gasping vagrant, and let justice assert its own rights.

However, I must protest against forming an estimate of character from *confidential communications*, divulged to serve no very honourable turn; or from hypothetical positions advanced by vanity and bravado, or wrung from vexation and resentment. No human being possesses a set of principles none of which admit of demur, and few act on maxims which, in a moment of irritation, they may possibly advance. It is of little consequence *which* of these combatants is more correct in the principles they advocate. Without much danger of mistake, we may set both down as not invulnerable in *all* their data, or irreprehensible in *all* their acts. Let them both, or only one of them, be erroneous; we are sure that neither would heedlessly trangress, or expose himself, wantonly, to universal animadversion.

On these letters the "Reformer" has made some strictures, not in the spirit of a judge but of a partizan, whose value it is not difficult to estimate. We may dismiss his introductory disquisition with little comment. By way of masking his real purpose, he drags in Sir Murray Maxwell, who has a gentle rebuke or two, and Mr. Hobhouse. But, soon forgetting that he was addressing the Electors of Westminster, with whom these personages *have something*

to do, he comes to his real object, to Mr. Cobbett, as it were reluctantly and by stealth, with whom the said electoral gentlemen have, at this time, *no* concern. And, having got hold of his prey, how he does belabor him: how he repeats the vulgar slang of the *Times* touching and concerning Mr. Cobbett's various political changes! These changes were not complained of while he continued to admire the Baronet, and rested at his *half-way-house*.—Change, *then*, only shewed his good sense, his openness to conviction, his readiness to avow it. Could not this mouth-piece of Sir Francis see that the very thing which he charges as a crime is, in truth, a virtue, a high honour, of which every honest man ought to be proud? Indeed, the progress of Mr. Cobbett is a phenomenon that should excite universal admiration. He has proceeded, step by step, as light broke in upon a vigorous intellect without early cultivation. He has stopped no where but where he thought he saw the truth. When he discovered his error, he avowed it, without regard to the fool's idol—Consistency. He halted not, however, by the way, till he has at last arrived at *Radical Reform*. There he has now taken up his quarters, probably not long to abide. It is not too much to expect that he will take up his staff, at no distant period, and walk on till he shall arrive at Republicanism, at Liberty, and Equality. Is this a crime? O, yes, it is a crime against Sir Francis and *his* reformers. Be it so. Vive Cobbett, *quand meme!*

Egotism and vanity are also laid to Mr. Cobbett's charge, and to support this accusation, the "Reformer," or rather the Baronet, has deviated from fidelity in the very printing of the *private correspondence*, ushered through your paper to the world. You who well know the effect of *Italics*, immediately perceive this disingenuousness. If Mr. Cobbett's call had justified publication, which it had not, the call could not justify *such a mode* of publication. Well, suppose we concede *vanity*. What then? Shew me the man who has more reason to be vain. He is an Archimedes, and he is more, for he *does* move the earth.

But no. The "Reformer" has discovered that Mr. Cobbett possesses no such power: his writings have no effect! The precious addresser of the Electors was beginning to be alarmed, and grew anxious to soothe the wrath of the mighty man whom he had ventured to injure. He recollected his talents, and took up a handful of incense to burn to them. They were a little complimented, awkwardly, indeed, as fear had produced a disagreeable debility of his nerves. But then, fright being somewhat abated, he took courage again; he eat his words, he unsaid what he had been saying, and, by perseverance, grew into a belief of his own *present* words. Talents! Fudge, they have *no effect!* They are misapplied. Alas! it is not because they are inefficient they are at one time awkwardly complimented, and then, on second thoughts, depreciated. They are too effectual for the comfort of Sir F. Burdett and *his* reformers. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ*. Hence arises this whole attack. The strong arm, the long arm, reaching, across the Atlantic, from America to Westminster, was felt at the last election, and nearly polled Sir Francis to the ground. Its touch paralized the population, and sad experience demonstrated that it was an effort, a Herculean effort, after the other candidates on that side had withdrawn except Mr. Hunt, to return Sir Francis for that city of which he had been so often pronounced the *Pride*. The union of the Electors in the interest of Major Cartwright, whom the friends of Sir Francis had so recently and so obstinately opposed, was scarcely able to accomplish his success as *second on the poll*. Be assured that another attempt of the same kind will never be made; nor, indeed, is it likely to be wanted; for *Sir Francis's zeal* for the people, no doubt, cannot fail, before that time, to be stimulated and rewarded by the promise or the grant of a PEERAGE.

I had almost forgotten that one charge against Mr. Cobbett is, that he has accused Sir Francis Burdett of having got connected with the Whigs. Indeed! Did not Mr. Hobhouse, at Pimlico, make the same accusation? but it was no accusation from him. Did he not avow that this connection actually exists? Does not the party of the Baronet begin to call for union, on the ground that the difference is trifling between Reformers of every class? Are they not earnestly called upon to forget *minor* disagreements, and join the great cause of *Reform*, mark me? These minor disagreements consist in this trifle; whether, by a certain *extension* of suffrage, the whole *people*, the general population, shall be put out of the pale of the Constitution, left without hope, and thrown by, as a rag of no value; or whether, by *universal suffrage*, the *People of England* shall have their RIGHTS. Hear this, O ye *People*. Sir Francis is no longer the Advocate *of the People*.

The "Reformer," on ushering in these *private letters*, has this most sagacious observation: "One main cause of this excessive bitterness (that of Mr. Cobbett) will be seen *from* the following correspondence: nor is the effect produced by the severe truths in Sir Francis's letter at all surprising, when it is considered how little Mr. Cobbett is capable of bearing contradiction." At the end of the Letters, the "Reformer" taketh up his pen again, and, like a giant refreshed, sayeth, "This was too much for Mr. Cobbett, and he seems (aye, he *seems*) "to have immediately gone to work to revenge himself." This supposes all things past, present, and to come. Let the date of the Baronet's letter be inspected; the 31st of January, 1818. Mr. Cobbett must have gone to work *immediately* indeed; for he went to work in the spring of 1817. Then look at the date of his Letter X to the Major, the 10th of October last. This was his last attack on Sir Francis. Of Sir Francis's letter, Mr. Cobbett at that time, Oct. 10, 1818, knew nothing, except circuitously, through the *Unitarian Priest*, who spoke of it at Liverpool. The *Unitarian Priest* was in London during the Westminster election in June or July last, when Mr. Brooks kindly submitted to him the epistle in question, committed for good purposes to his custody. If it was not received so late as the 10th of October, 1818, how comes it to be dated Jan. 31, 1818? Was it composed for exhibition at Westminster, and antedated to throw suspicion off its guard! Has it ever been dispatched? Has it ever been received? But to return to the "Reformer." One knows not which most to wonder at, the folly of this advocate of the Baronet, or the Baronet's own in suffering him thus to expose him. The Baronet has something more to answer for. His advocate from mere stupidity might thus ascribe an effect to a cause that could not exist. He sees not through a millstone any more than another. But the Baronet's *severe truths* could not, without being in the possession of Mr. Cobbett, have been the *cause* of his bitterness, excessive or not excessive. This the "Reformer" overlooked from folly. Sir Francis, however, knew well the true state of the case, and must have relied on the escape of the remark from detection, at least till it had produced its effect. He may have remembered the saying of a cunning Queen of France, that *a lie, undetected for three weeks, has the same effect as truth*. Short sighted man! He has been disappointed, if he expected that detection would be quite so tardy. The "Reformer" proceeds: "he first commenced by accusing Sir Francis of having got connected with the Whigs, &c." Such gross folly needs not to be further exposed by stating that Mr. Cobbett *first* commenced, to use the "Reformer's" elegant diction, to attack the Baronet in the spring of 1817, soon after his arrival in America, nearly a year before this epistle had issued from Sir Francis's head or heart, if the date be *not* falsified, and more than a year, if it was manufactured for the benefit of his election. He *next* commenced and recommenced, occasionally, the same attack, till the 10th of October, the date of his last onset, at which time the epistle, containing the *severe truths*, which was *too*

match for Mr. Cobbett, had not been sent probably, and certainly not received.

Allow me to observe, before I conclude this letter to you, already too long, that disingenuous conduct seldom fails to confound, and cover with shame, those by whom it is adopted. Indeed, its detection and exposure may sometimes be slow, but the consequence is generally more overwhelming when it arrives. Of this a *forged* letter, produced on several occasions in Westminster, comes in proof, the principals and accessaries in which *forgery* can no longer, without shame, look at the face of an honest man, or at any face but that of one another. Of this also, the publication of this *private correspondence* comes in proof, the exposure of which has not lingered so long. And, finally, it may not be inexpedient to put persons in this predicament in mind, that, to sustain a bad cause, no ordinary advocate should be employed, or bad will become worse; as the cause of Sir Francis Burdett has experienced in the hands of *his* "Reformer." NO PARTISAN.

Jan. 6, 1819.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

PARIS, JAN. 11.—M. Juge, editor of "French Letters to the Champ d'Asile," was arrested on the 9th instant, and conducted to La Force prison, by virtue of a warrant from the Juge d'Instruction.

AMERICA—UNITED STATES.

(From the National Intelligencer.)

ARBUTHNOT AND AMBRISTER.—"When we first heard of the execution of the sentence of death on these miserable men, we suggested the propriety of suspending our opinions on this subject, until the facts should be officially before us. We have laid them before our readers, and given time to make up their opinions, before we obtruded upon them any suggestions of ours on this subject.

"An attentive perusal of the documents, and considerable reflection on the subject, have confirmed the opinion we expressed some months ago, that the case of these persons neither required nor permitted the intervention of the British or any other foreign Government. It is then a question entirely between ourselves—between the officers of Government and the people.

"We wish we could say with equal confidence, that we entirely approve of the proceedings of the Court by which these men were condemned. We mean not to palliate their offence, but to express our doubts whether their punishment was properly administered. We express our thoughts on this subject with much diffidence. Being ignorant of the law martial, we are guided to our decision by established principles of national and of civil law, applicable, we presume, to all criminal trials, by whatever court, in our country.

"Arbuthnot merited punishment, doubtless, for his officious intermeddling with the Indians, and for having, under pretence of trading with them, and counselling them to assert their rights, excited them to hostilities against us. It is another question, whether his offence was a military one, or properly cognizable by a military tribunal. It is at least certain, that this person was completely in our power, and that there was no danger of his escape, or of his effecting any thing, while in confinement, prejudicial to the operations of the army. To have held him in confinement, therefore, subject to the directions of a higher authority, it appears to us, would have been, if an error at all, an error on the safe side of the question.

"With respect to the evidence before the Court in this case, our respect for the character of the officers composing it, obliges us, little conversant as we have professed to be (and may we long be!) with military law, to presume it was such as the law admits. And this is all we shall say of it.

"In the case of Ambrister, the evidence is conclusive enough. He was found in arms against the United States, and pleaded guilty to the charge of leading the Lower Creeks to battle. He identified himself with the enemy, and subjected himself to their fate. But when taken, did he not become a prisoner of war, and was he not entitled to the privileges of that character? If so, did he become properly the subject of trial by a Court-martial?

"We are under the impression, that the offences of both these individuals were such as it would have been better not to have committed to the judgment of a military tribunal; but having been so committed, that it would have been expedient to have submitted the sentence, before execution, to the highest authority known to the constitution, for its revision.

"On the principle of *retaliation*, recognized by all nations, these persons, we conceive, might have been lawfully put to death. They had identified themselves with the Indians; and, though claiming themselves to be British subjects, did not prove themselves to be such, and were, according to our doctrine on the subject of allegiance, actually expatriated. The military practices of the Indians, contrary to the laws of war, the Commanding General had a clear right to retaliate. He did so in the case of the Indian Chief Francis Hornathlemee, and he might have done so in the case of Arbuthnot and Ambrister. In being brought to the bar of a Court-martial, however, did they not become subject to the operations of our laws applicable to their case? And is there any law on our statute-book which embraces it?

"The whole subject is full of difficulty.

"In regard to the decision of the General with respect to the sentence on Ambrister, which appears to have attracted much notice, it is proper to observe, it was no doubt dictated by a regard to the wishes of the prisoner, who preferred death to the ignominious punishment for which that fate was commuted by the Court. Whether this was a sufficient justification of the decision, we shall not undertake to pronounce."

UNITED PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Thursday, Jan. 14.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT—AND CHOICE OF SPEAKERS.

This being the day fixed for the meeting of the new Parliament, a considerable number of Peers were assembled by two o'clock.

The Earl of LIVERPOOL informed their Lordships, that a Commission had been issued under the Great Seal, appointing the Lord Chief Baron, Sir Richard Richards, to sit and officiate in that House instead of the Lord Chancellor, to supply his Lordship's place on all occasions when he may be absent.—The Commission was read by the clerk.—The Earl then moved, that Sir Richard Richards, Knight, the Lord Chief Baron, do take his seat on the woolsack, and that the mace be borne before him as before the Lord Chancellor.—The motion being agreed to, the Lord Chief Baron took his seat.

The LORD CHIEF BARON then stated, that he was directed to acquaint the House, that the Regent had issued Letters Patent, appointing certain Lords to act as Commissioners for opening the present Parliament. Their Lordships would soon be ready to take their seats, and in the mean time he should propose that the House adjourn during pleasure.

After a short adjournment, the House was resumed, and the Lords Commissioners entered and took their seats. They were the Earl of Harrowby, the Duke of Wellington, the Earl of Liverpool, the Earl of Westmorland, and the Earl of Shaftesbury.

The Earl of HARROWBY directed Sir Thomas Tyrwhitt, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, to inform the House of Commons, that the Lords Commissioners had taken their seats, and desired the attendance of the Members of that House at the bar.

In a few minutes the Black Rod returned, and was followed to the bar by a number of Members, at the head of whom were Mr. Dyson and other clerks of that House.

The Earl of HARROWBY said, that as it was not convenient for the Prince Regent to attend, Letters Patent had been issued, commanding them to open the Parliament in the usual forms.

The Commission was read by the clerk; after which

The Earl of HARROWBY said, that the Commissioners had it in command from the Prince Regent, to make known to their Lordships and the Gentlemen of the House of Commons, that as soon as a sufficient number of the Members should be sworn, the causes of calling the present Parliament would be declared to them.

The Commons retired from the bar.

The Lords present then proceeded to take the usual oaths

which occupied the time of the House until four o'clock.—Adjourned.

Friday, Jan. 15.

At two o'clock the Lords Commissioners took their seats.

The Earl of HARROWBY ordered the Gentleman-Usher of the Black Rod to summon the Commons.

Soon after Mr. MANNERS SUTTON came to the bar, attended by a number of Members of the House of Commons. He stated, that his Majesty's faithful Commons had proceeded to choose a Speaker; and that the choice had fallen on him. He was well aware of the difficulties of this important office, and could not but feel that he was deficient in the necessary qualifications for discharging its duties; and he was perfectly satisfied, that if it should please the Prince Regent to disapprove of the choice, it would afford an opportunity for the selection of a person who might fill the office with more ability than he could hope to do.

The Earl of HARROWBY said, the Commissioners had it in command from the Prince Regent to declare, that he was well convinced of his (Mr. M. Sutton's) ability to discharge the important office of Speaker of the House of Commons; that his Royal Highness, acting in the name and on the behalf of his Majesty, did approve of the choice made by the Commons, and that they (the Commissioners) had it therefore in command to confirm the election.

The SPEAKER then stated, that in the name of the Commons of Great Britain and Ireland, he claimed, by humble petition, a full and ample confirmation of all their ancient rights and privileges, especially freedom of debate, freedom from arrest, and from all personal molestation of themselves and their servants; free access to the Throne on all just, necessary, and proper occasions; and that the most favourable construction might be put upon all their proceedings.

The Earl of HARROWBY replied, that the Lords Commissioners had it in command from the Prince Regent to declare, that he grants and confirms to his Majesty's faithful Commons, all the rights and privileges which they have enjoyed during his Majesty's reign, or any of his predecessors, and that the most favourable construction would be put on all their proceedings.

The Speaker then withdrew.—Adjourned till Monday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, Jan. 14.

This House met at half-past two o'clock. There were about 120 Members present. The four City Members attended in their municipal robes, and took their seats in succession on the Treasury Bench.

A Message was announced, summoning the House to the Lords, to hear the Commission read. On their return, Mr. PEEL addressed the House, in a speech of some length, in which he expatiated upon the importance of the duty for which they had met, and after an eulogium upon the public and private conduct of the late Speaker, he moved, that Mr. Manners Sutton should be elected to the Chair.

The late Speaker was then called by acclamation to the Chair. On taking his place, supported by the Mover and Seconder, he addressed a speech to the House, expressing his feelings of gratitude for the proud distinction with which they had honoured him.

Mr. CANNING congratulated the House upon the choice they had made. He spoke of the mild, able, and firm manner in which the Speaker had formerly exercised his right of controul and authority to protect their privileges, and concluded by moving an adjournment.—Adjourned.

Friday, Jan. 15.

Mr. MANNERS SUTTON.—"I have to acquaint the House, that this House has been to the House of Peers, where the Lords have declared the Prince Regent's approval and confirmation of the election by this House of me as Speaker, and that I did thereupon lay claim, by humble petition, to all its ancient undoubted rights and privileges; more especially freedom of discussion and debate, freedom for the Members, their servants and estates, from arrest and molestation; free access to the Royal presence, at all times when necessary; and that the most favourable construction should be put upon their proceedings; all of which were granted and allowed in as full and ample a manner as they have been granted and allowed by his Majesty or any of his Royal predecessors. I may be now once more permitted to express to the House the deep sense of gratitude I feel for this most distinguished mark of its confidence. I implore of the House its constant and steady support, in enabling me to maintain strict attention to its established rules and orders, which are not more essential to the convenient despatch of business, than they are to the dignity and independence of the House itself. I have now only further to submit to the House, that the first and only proceeding we can now enter upon, is taking the oaths of supremacy and allegiance, making and subscribing the declaration, and further taking the oath of abjuration.

The SPEAKER then took the usual oaths, and the Clerk proceeded to read over the names of the several counties. One Member appeared from Bedfordshire, two from Berkshire, one from Cambridgeshire, and *more than* 30 *from Cornwall*—(Boroughmongering Cornwall). This disproportion excited some laughter.

A number of Members then took the oaths in the ordinary forms.—Adjourned.

TUESDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

BANKRUPTCY SUPERSEDED.

M. Obren, jun., Broad-street, Ratcliffe, oilman.

BANKRUPTS.

L. Ingram, Cheapside, hatter. Attorney, Mr. Birkett, Cloak-lane.

J. Jacob, Gravel-lane, Houndsditch, tobacconist. Attorney, Mr. Norton, Mincries.

T. Phillips, Bread-street-hill, merchant. Attorney, Mr. Clarke, Bishopsgate-street-without.

J. Venus, Lower Shadwell, victner. Attornies, Messrs. Robinson and Burrows, Austinfriars.

J. Atkinson, Dalston, Cumberland, cotton-manufacturer. Attorney, Mr. Birkett, Cloak-lane.

W. Everett, Cambridge, corn-merchant. Attorney, Mr. Croft, Chancery-lane.

M. Paterson, Halifax, Yorkshire, dyer. Attornies, Messrs. Morton and Williamson, Gray's-inn-square.

J. Kendrick, Bellington-mills, Worcestershire, miller. Attornies, Messrs. Lodington and Hall, Temple.

R. Friday, jun., Isleworth, Middlesex, barge-master. Attornies, Messrs. Noy and Hardstone, Mincing-lane.

J. Blackborn, Witham, Essex, corn-factor. Attorney, Mr. Carter, Staple-inn, Holborn.

SUPPLEMENT.

On Thursday was published a Supplement to the *London Gazette* of the 12th instant, containing extracts of despatches from Lord Hastings, with others from subordinate officers. Each of the three Presidences holding direct communication with the East India House, and all being frequently anticipated by private letters, the same intelligence is thus repeated from several distinct sources, though under nearly similar forms. In the extract from the despatches of the Marquis of Hastings, Sir John Malcolm receives the highest credit for the skill and ability and subsequent moderation of his conduct towards Bajee Row. The troops remaining with this Chieftain were, on the route towards Gwalior, so entirely surrounded, that advance and retreat were equally impossible; resistance to the combined force of Sir J. Malcolm and General Doveton was an expedient no less desperate than the effort to escape; so that the Ex-Peishwa had no alternative but that of unqualified submission; and the terms imposed upon him were, that he should reside in the city of Benares as a private individual, with an income suited to a person of high birth, but without any other pretensions. The reports from Colonel M'Dowell respect the siege of Mulligaum, and the ultimate surrender of that fortress: the admiration excited by the bravery of our troops is checkered with deep regret for the loss of so many valuable lives as were sacrificed in the course of that service. The capture of the fort of Moolheir terminated the war in the dominions of the conquered Peishwa. The Gazette concludes with an account of a successful action, on the part of Brigadier-General Hardyman, at the head of the 17th British infantry and the 8th regiment of native horse, against a numerous body of the Nagpore Rajah's troops, in the vicinity of Jubbulpore. After a short conflict, the enemy were beaten with considerable slaughter, and all the guns in their possession taken. The immediate occupation of Jubbulpore, together with its stores and cannon, was the consequence.

SATURDAY'S LONDON GAZETTE.

BANKRUPTS.

W. Flint, Old Bailey, printer. Attornies, Messrs. Amory and Coles, Lothbury.

J. C. Jennyns, Catherine-street, Strand, dealer. Attorney, Mr. Comerford, Copthall-court, Throgmerton-street.

T. Young, Paddington-street, St. Mary-le-bonne, grocer. Attorney, Mr. Shuter, Millbank-street, Westminster.

H. Hayward, Great Portland-street, paper-hanger. Attorney, Mr. Archer, Southampton-street, Bloomsbury-square.

J. H. Wilson, jun. Upper Belgrave-place, Pimlico, picture-dealer. Attorney, Mr. Newcombe, Vine-street, Piccadilly.

W. Lumley, Jermyn-street, St. James's, wine-merchant. Attorney, Mr. Oshaldeston, London-street, Fenchurch-street.

D. Gardiner, Chiswell-street, Finsbury-square, hatter. Attorney, Mr. Clabon, Mark-lane.

W. Daniels, jun. Bishop-Stortford, Hertfordshire, malt-factor. Attorney, Mr. Makinson, Elm-court, Temple.

R. Cassels, St. Swithin's-lane, merchant. Attorney, Mr. Poole, Adam's-court, Old Broad-street.

E. Lush, Sherbourne, Dorsetshire, linen-draper. Attornies, Messrs. King and Lukin, Gray's-inn-square.

J. Davey, Foulsham, Norfolk, ironmonger. Attornies, Messrs. Tilson and Preston, Coleman-street.

J. Power and R. Warwick, Finsbury-square, merchants. Attorney, Mr. Warne, Change-Alley.

J. Churchill, Stanhope-street, Clare-Market, common-brewer. Attorney, Mr. Brown, London-Commercial-Sale-Rooms.

J. J. Pidding, High-Holborn, stock-broker. Attorney, Mr. Guy, Howard-street, Strand.

G. Parsons, Hanover-street, Long Acre, coach-plater and founder. Attornies, Messrs. Robins and Hill, Serjeant's Inn.

W. Morgan, Bristol, victualler. Attorney, Mr. King, Serjeant's Inn.

PRICE OF STOCKS ON SATURDAY.

3 per Cent. Red. ..... 78 1/4 3/4 | 3 per Cent. Cons. ..... 77 7/8 78 1/8.

THE EXAMINER.

London, JANUARY 17.

There is little news this week from abroad. An air was wished to be given to the sudden death of the young Queen of Spain, as if it was not unknown, though not common, in cases of child-bed. But it remains to be known whether child-bed really had any thing to do with it. The death was confessedly most sudden and unexpected; and it has since transpired, that on the same day her Majesty was walking about at Court, and mingling with others as usual. The advices which bring this account conclude with saying, "And now adieu to all pardons and amnesties!" We are much mistaken, however, if the pardons and amnesties will not be needed on a very different side. The "banditti," as they are called, increase every day, and with them the Creature's beating at heart, and apparently the savage stupidity of the reptiles about him. There are some pretended innocents in politics, who, because their next door neighbours do not poison ladies in childbed, will ask the public with an air of reprobating astonishment, whether such things could be possible? Let history, we repeat, answer them. Every thing is possible for a set of bigots and inquisitors, but Humanity.

The Duke of Richelieu, it seems, is to decline the offer of a recompense in vain. His good-natured friends will insist that he shall not excel them in delicacy for nothing, or go out of office with an unequivocal reputation.

Extract of a letter from Ceylon, of the 18th August last:—"The unfortunate war in the Candian country is further than ever from a termination. Amongst the number of officers who have already died of the fever are Capt. Jones, Capt. Langton, Dr. Hoper, Capt. Gray, Lieut. Crutwell, and Lieut. Taylor, and many others; I dare not venture to say how many more. Poor Mrs. Gray, Mrs. Jones, Mrs. Taylor, Mrs. Crutwell, and Mrs. Green, are widows; some of them with large families. People say that military men of considerable experience have declared that it will require 60,000 men to hold the Candian country under the present system; there are even at present 20,000 men, including the sepoys of the Company, and their coolies, &c. in the country.—The sickness has been, and is, melancholy; upwards of 1,000 men are in hospitals; and the expense, including the reinforcements that are expected from Bengal, is almost as great as that of the English force in France."

"We observe (says the *Courier*) by Sir Murray Maxwell's advertisement, that he feels himself compelled to decline offering himself as a Candidate for Westminster, because "those conditions have not been fulfilled in the degree which would hold out a reasonable prospect of success." The gallant Officer's private fortune does not justify him in incurring the expense of a contest—And those who pretend to wish to see Westminster rescued from the little junto that kept it in thraldom decline giving any thing more than their wishes—Silly short-sighted persons! They would have all the benefits and blessings of the Constitution, but not a pound will they subscribe in defence of them—This is an omission which the revolutionists will chuckle to crow over—And indeed they have some reason. Shall opposition to the Government and disaffection to the State be avowed, and pecuniary assistance be furnished? Shall blasphemy and sedition be thriving occupations, but love for the Constitution be a virtue that is to be its own reward? This lukewarmness is base, hateful and disgusting. But we trust it is yet time to rouse a feeling that shall rescue the capital from its threatened degradation.—There is plenty of time if the hand and the heart be active. Shall the capital exhibit to the rest of England an example of criminal indifference? Whilst lesser cities and even towns have shewn their attachment to the Constitution, is Westminster to manifest an utter carelessness and dereliction of it?—"Who is not for me is against me," the Constitution may well exclaim—who will not bestir himself in behalf of it, must care little or nothing whether it stand or fall. And this will deservedly be said of the capital, if it remain in its present state of supineness and apathy."—Poor *Courier!* Poor Sir Murray!

Ward *v.* Clement.—A verdict was obtained yesterday for the plaintiff, with 600*l.* damages, for a political libel, in the *Observer*, on Mr. Ward, who was one of the sufferers under the Suspension Act, and had been grossly used by the Magistrates in the country.—Mr. Ward is represented as a man of good character, possessing great firmness. The friends of liberty, we are informed, mean to give him a dinner on Tuesday next, to commemorate his deserved victory over meanness and falsehood.

At the Old Bailey, on Friday, several prisoners pleaded guilty to the offence of having forged Bank-notes in their possession; and yesterday, *John Adams* was capitally convicted of uttering five forged 5*l.* notes.

Mr. Hazlitt is going to repeat his most instructive and entertaining Lectures on the Comic Writers and Genius of Great Britain, at the Crown and Anchor. He commences next Tuesday evening. This situation is more centrical and convenient for such a purpose, not half so far for many, and unattended with those tragic cuts of wind that come careering at you through the ballustrades of Blackfriars Bridge, like carving knives betwixt Aldermen's legs.

THE JEWS.—The following extract of a letter will give some idea of the freedom enjoyed by the Jews in Lubeck:—

"With feelings of horror and indignation I take up my pen to communicate to you some of the particulars of a transaction which has taken place in the *free* city of Lubeck—a transaction more disgraceful or arbitrary, I will venture to say, is not to be met with in the history of any civilized country; and, be it remembered, this city is under the immediate protection of the Emperor of Austria. Will the world believe, when they read the famous Decree of 1818, when they see the old statutes of 1768, and the more famous one of 1788, are again to be put in full force? What must have been the feelings of persons who have resided there for years, following their various occupations? What must have been the feelings of fathers, sitting with their wives, enjoying the innocent sport of their children—what must have been their feelings, I say, when they read this famous decree, *forbidding their carrying on business in any manner whatever?*—To complete the ruin, the police officers were ordered to search all Jews, openly in the streets, or to burst open their houses, and take possession of their property—seal it up, even the common necessaries of life! To prevent the possibility of any evasive measures, the Senate decree that any person acting for or in any shape transacting business with a Jew, shall for the first offence be fined; for the second, fined and imprisoned, and lose his right of citizenship: and any clerk, porter, or menial servant, living with a Jew, shall be imprisoned, and expelled this *free* town! You may recollect, that before Bonaparte entered Germany, and declared the Jews *citizens, and members of society*, they were treated as common beasts; and on passing through several towns had to pay the same sum *per head* which was paid for *swine!* The war being ended, the Jews were led to expect that the Sovereigns would have redressed their grievances, and that they would have been allowed to enjoy those rights and liberties enjoyed by their Christian neighbours; but, alas! the Sovereigns forgot their promises; they forgot that Jews were human—that they were the work of the same Almighty Creator. Are these the good things for which the people of Europe have fought and bled?

The Emperor of AUSTRIA, from this treatment of his Jewish subjects, appears to be an admirer of the creed of the renowned SANCHO: "I believe in all that our Holy Church prescribes, and I mortally hate all Jews and Heretics."—But SANCHO, however disfigured by ignorance and sensuality, had a heart in his breast; which is more than can be affirmed of the Imperial Proscriber.—BONAPARTE indeed! Perhaps one of the heaviest sins of this celebrated man, in the eyes of posterity, will be his having neglected to entirely put down the vile unteachable set, who now, in the drunkenness of unlooked-for prosperity, dare thus to disgust, denounce, and trample upon their fellow men. * * * * * * * After all, such doings may in fact be blessings in disguise.—"Yet a little while, O my soul."

THE ARTS.—The PRINCE REGENT has been graciously pleased to permit Mr. MUNDE to have the portrait of Lord HUTCHINSON, from his collection, in order to take a copy for the Medallic Series. This excellent picture is now in the possession of Mr. WEBB, of Longdon, near this city, who executes the engraving.—*Lichfield Mercury.*

By an achievement beyond their former works, Artists, and especially younger ones, sometimes appear to give assurance of their having reached, with the Old Masters, a high and continued power of performance, but in their next works dash down our expectations. Not so with Mr. HILTON. His Picture of *Una*, so justly admired in last year's R. A. Exhibition, has been, we think, even exceeded by his *Europa*, just now finished for Sir J. LEICESTER, and forms a prominent work in the Gallery of that distinguished Patron. Hereafter we shall "give it honour due" by a particular notice, in company with some masterly additions by the President, the Professor of Painting to the Royal Academy, and others.

SUPERIORITY TO REVENGE.—The illustrious DESCARTES used to say, that when he received an injury, he seated himself so high above it, that it could not reach him.—*Literary Pocket Book.*

MR. TOKELEY.—This excellent actor died suddenly the other day of such a fierce propulsion of blood to the head, that for many hours it rendered him frantic. Mr. TOKELY, though young, always appeared liable to something of this sort, or a stroke of apoplexy. His system was overbloated, and his neck very short. Perhaps his very early acquaintance with the stage (for many of our readers may recollect him as Master TOKELY) may have led him into too free a style of living for his habit of body. He is said to have been a pleasant good-tempered man, as we can easily imagine from his very pleasant and good-tempered style of performance. He could evidently joke with his own corporeal infirmities; and the stage has lost a representative of joviality, national manners, and even of homely pathos, which it may take a long time to replace.

POUR ET CONTRE, or who shall decide?—A question of vital importance to Bankers and Money-changers, &c. came on a few months back in the Court of Exchequer. The outline is this:—In July, 1816, a cause was tried, in which the Crown was Plaintiff, and two Individuals were Defendants, respecting the legality of buying and selling Bills of Exchange at a rate over and above the legal per centage, while such Bills were in progress to maturity.—Baron RICHARDS, after having summed up, was asked the following question by the Foreman of the Jury:—QUERY. Can a Bill of Exchange be bought at a rate above five per cent. before that Bill becomes due?—ANSWER. Certainly.—The verdict was accordingly given for the Crown—*Ainsi va la Loi* POUR *le Roi.*—On the 10th of May, 1817, a rule was obtained for a new trial, and the Barons of the Exchequer were unanimously of opinion,—That the Bills upon which the verdict was given, in 1816, for the Crown, were concocted in usury—*Ainsi va la Loi* CONTRE *le Roi.*

It is related, that an Eastern Prince, on being informed that one of his Judges had been guilty of an iniquitous judgment, ordered him to be flayed, and *his skin to be stuffed into the cushion of the seat of Justice.* His successor, it was remarked, was one of the most upright Judges that ever existed; but it is added, that he was on many occasions observed to wriggle very much in his seat.

COURT AND FASHIONABLES.

LORD ERSKINE.—The marriage of this eminent Lawyer is not generally known, although it took place so far back as October last, at Gretna-Green. It is certain that little notice of this remarkable event has yet appeared in the public prints. In October his Lordship arrived at Gretna, accompanied by Miss SARAH BUCK, the present Lady ERSKINE, by whom he had had several children out of the pale of wedlock. He was dressed in fashionable female attire, with a large Leghorn bonnet and long veil. On the arrival of the officiating Priest of the Temple of Hymen, his Lordship threw off his dress, and appeared in *propria personæ*, and the usual ceremony being gone through, the parties were declared man and wife! His Lordship again put on his female vestments and was on the point of taking his departure, when his son, the Hon. THOMAS ERSKINE, made his appearance in a chaise and four; but the knot was tied, and, shortly after, the new married couple drove off. The bride is about 35 years old—the Noble bridegroom nearly 70. The object of this very extraordinary step is said to be for the purpose of legalizing the children of this connexion, who, according to Scottish law, cease to be illegitmate on the marriage of their parents at any time.—*Aris's Birmingham Gazette.*

Apprehensions, we are sory to hear, begin to be entertained with respect to the duration of our good old KING's life, in consequence of an alteration in his diet and regimen. It is now some time since the KING met with an accident from stumbling over a chair, in his daily perambulations through the five apartments. His Majesty's left leg was much hurt, and he was confined for some time before he recovered the use of it. The only exercise the KING now

takes is that of being wheeled about in one of Merlin's chairs. We stated some time ago that the suite of rooms occupied by the KING were in a very dilapidated state, owing to the want of repairs in due time. We stated that these apartments were shored up; scaffolding poles have since been introduced, and every other necessary precaution has been taken.—*Morning paper.*

The lately proved will of her late MAJESTY, has, as it will be observed, some remarkable features. The Queen of WURTEMBURGH seems only to be mentioned that it may be marked how completely she is slighted, or set aside. Not a pendant for her ear, or a cross for her bosom, from all that immense store of jewels—not a ring, or a lock of hair, as a dying memento of affection: BONAPARTE made her a Queen—she is provided for—she is reminded of that, and that remembrance was her only legacy. It was, as some of our readers know, some years ago reported very generally, that this Princess, the then only married daughter of her MAJESTY, had been guilty of writing a letter, in which she spoke with grateful admiration of NAPOLEON, who had made her husband a King, and consequently promoted her from the rank of Duchess to that of Queen!!! Unpardonable sin of gratitude!!! Is it never to be forgiven, if it finds rare admission into a royal bosom?—*Stamford News.*

LITERARY NOTICES.

No. 47.

A Selection of Irish Melodies with Symphonies and Accompaniments by Sir John Stevenson, Mus. Doc., and Characteristic Words by Thomas Moore, Esq. Number the Seventh.—(Concluded.)

THE chief beauties of Mr. Moore's lyric writings consist in their being the result of evident enjoyment, in their fancy, their national character, their exquisite adaptation to the music, and in that mixture of a tendency to pleasure with a sympathy for the sufferings of others, which forms the most attractive part of the amiable. His patriotism is observable throughout his works, but is naturally seen to most anvantage in the more serious compositions, equally to the poet's honour, and the disgrace of his country's ill-users. With respect to the adaptation, the words are written with such a strong sense of the musical, that they almost break out into singing of their own accord; and his genius, in general, of which we shall say more presently, is like April weather run into June,—the tears are so kindly, and the laughing warmth so complete.

The faults of these, like the rest of all Mr. Moore's writings, are a tendency to repeat the same images, and now and then (arising perhaps from a consciousness of this) an elaborate hunting after others. The former, though apparently of a commoner nature, is not so unpleasant, because it seems a part of luxury to dwell upon it's sensations, and repeat what has delighted it. The latter disturbs us, because it go s to the very opposite extreme. You see the author disturbed himself, which is the worst thing in the world for a bestower of enjoyment. He gets up and toils in his sunshine, when he ought to be supereminently at his ease. This is the reason, why several of the songs have so inferior a termination with so beautiful a commencement. They are Syrens too literally.

Desinit in piscem mulier formosa superne.

This is the result of the author's modesty, and of his looking at his own writings too critically. He thinks he shall not have said enough for our wisdom and our money; whereas we beg him to look on the former as a very poor business compared with his genius, and the latter as better earned by half than the whole. If Mr. Moore could keep his wit for it's proper place, and deny himself these redundant similes and epigrammatic tail-pieces, his serious poetry would be as good as his humourous. It would present to us the grave aspect of pleasure in as good earnest as the laughing.

We cannot but congratulate the publisher on the improvement in his engravings. We do not allude to the musical and typographical part, which was always excellent, but to the vignette in the title-page, which in the present number is from the pencil of Stothard. It is Ireland personified, looking mournfully at her harp. The face is one of those most exquisite human ones, full of goodness and sincerity, which it seems the peculiar province of this amiable artist to delineate. The best thing we can say for it, at least the best thing we can say to shew our own opinion of it, is that we mean to take it out, and have it put in a frame.

And now a word or two respecting the moral character and tendency of Mr. Moore's writings. He is accused of licentiousness; and the accusation, after gradually softening away before the evident amiableness of his poetry in general, has been suddenly and extravagantly bawled forth by some Ministerial hireling, whose masters have been provoked by the poet's honesty and independence. We can do no more than allude to the loathsome publication in which the charge appeared. It is a work used by the Quarterly Reviewers, and by the toad-eaters of toad-eaters, for venting the ribaldry and poison, which even they have not the face to do in their more official character. The public know it well enough, for every species of infamy. Now it is curious enough, and quite in character, that such a charge should be extravagantly made by such a publication. They who can see the best things in a bad light, and have an instinctive fear that they should be thought to see all things in too good a one, will affect the utmost excess of reprobation against what they object to; always taking care however to object, or pretend to be fierce, only out of personal feelings. The vehement accusers of Mr. Moore do not know what they are talking about. They see only the ill or the doubtful. They are too gross to discover his sentiment, and too conscious of their servility not to hate his patriotism. He writes twenty passages full of the most generous virtue, to one whose tendency can be called in question; but they see, and wish to see, nothing but the latter. In fact, they like it for its own sake; and then out of an over-consciousness, pretend that they abhor it. It is such men as these (or if they do not, they are worse than we think them) who take a writer like Boccaccio for a mere retailer of licentious stories, till their betters inform them otherwise. And such men as these, if they were not afraid, would represent Nature herself as a polluted and profligate thing; nay, they actually do their best with their ribaldry, to shew that such is their nature at any rate. The specimen of Mr. Moore's licentiousness which the publication above alluded to produced, was most unfortunately selected. It was the well-known song beginning,—

When in death I shall calm recline,
Oh take my heart to my mistress dear;
Tell her it lived upon smiles, and wine
Of the brightest hue, while it lingered here.
Bid her not shed one tear of sorrow, &c.

This was to be a horrid sample of a licentious poet, joking on his death-bed; but in the first place, the poet was not on his death-bed:—and in the second, there is a sentiment in the song of a most affectionate and generous nature. He does not wish his mistress to grieve,—which would be sacrificing her comfort to his egotism; he wishes her to be happy still, and to think of him only as far as it will keep her so. The same sentiment, carried farther, is the soul of the most divine of SHAKSPEARE'S sonnets,—the one beginning

No longer mourn for me when I am dead.

The truth is, that when Mr. Moore was a young man, and lived much in what is called the town, he did write some licentious songs, which are not to be found in the works that go under his name. But observe the spirit with which he wrote them. There are people undoubtedly who are profligate out of absolute wickedness, that is to say, out of a stupidity to virtue, and an appreciation of only the worst side of every thing. These men carry the language of liberal opinion to an excess, out of cunning and selfishness; and shew in all their actions and writings that they do so. On the other hand, there are people who are instinctive believers in goodness and amiableness, and who will occasionally carry the same language to the same excess out of a notion that no harm will be done; or from a feeling that the exceeders on that side of the question have more elements of the kindly and social in them than ninety-nine out of a hundred of the worldly hypocrites whom they believed to be as good as every one else, till they found them at once possessing reputation and not deserving it. That this was Mr. Moore's case is evident from his works at large. If he has formerly given opportunities to the profligate to mistake and misuse him, it is as Nature herself has done; both he and she are full of sentiment and virtue, and could they give law to the world, would make a finer thing of it with the least part of their qualities than others do with their greatest and gravest. Observe. He has railed against marriage, as Johnson has declaimed against it; and it is supposed by many to be a very improvable matter;—yet he married. He talked as if he had been the idlest fellow about town; yet he was a hard reading scholar. He made humanity appear a light, and sometimes perhaps an unaffectionate thing; yet no man has shewn also a warmer heart for his friends, a truer sympathy with his country, or a more generous and happy-making regard for his species at large. No man, in short, has had a truer contempt for the heartless; *and this is his great offence.* The women-haters, the envious, the servile, the tyrannical, the hypocritical, the sheer coxcombs and ribalds, all shew what virtues he possesses, by hating *him*. Mr. Giffard, Mr. Croker, or Mr. Southey, may have exceeded in the same way as Mr. Moore, but there is more real virtue in the rest of his works than in all the writings of them and their friends put together. Their very virtues, or what they call such, would render society a dreary and bigoted intercourse of slaves and tyrants, egotistical, vindictive, and hopeless, affectedly placid and most intensely selfish:—but out of the very tendencies of the least reputable part of his poetry, the philosopher could gather suggestions of improvement, that would help to sweep away all their artificial virtues at once, and enable us to behold the world again in it's greenness and gladsomeness. His is the natural piety of sympathy and enjoyment:—theirs the involuntary impiousness of compromises with worldliness, a contempt of their fellow-creatures, and an ill opinion, which they are nevertheless afraid to acknowledge, of God himself.

MAJOR ROCHEFORT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

10, *Park-street, Baker-street, Jan.* 12. 1819.

Sir,—In your *Examiner* of yesterday, I read, with unfeigned regret and surprise, a long paragraph, purporting to be the statement of a Mr. S. Hancock, and a representation of misconduct in the respectable British Consul at Ostend.

I do not mean to enter into the particular case of Mr. S. Hancock, with which I am perfectly unacquainted, but I must observe, that it seems to me to have been rather hasty in you, and contrary to your usual spirit of equity, to circulate the declaration of any rash or intemperate individual as the general sentiment of the English Merchants, or Traders to the port of Ostend, and I am sure you will allow, upon due reflection, that Mr. S. Hancock's enmity may have induced him to ascribe unjustly to others the dissatisfaction and hostility with which his mind seems overcharged, and consequently, that you should have required other, and more dispassionate representations, before you allowed the *Examiner* to be used as the means of circulating an unpleasant statement respecting an absent individual. Whether Major Rochefort may condescend to notice the paragraph to which I allude or not, is to me quite doubtful; but I cannot resist a very natural desire to do justice to an Officer whose benevolence, philanthropy, and urbanity, I have very repeatedly witnessed, and whose liberality and attention to the interest and happiness of his countrymen is no where surpassed, and seldom equalled.

Many an English subject has experienced from his bounty and benignity that relief and assistance which paternal feelings alone could dictate; and I have seen the Major bestow as much attention, kindness, and industry, in serving a pauper, as others would have shewn in courting the patronage and applause of a Prince! His greatest delight seemed to be in serving those unhappy beings whose situation precluded every hope or prospect of making any other return for his favours, than the expression of an eternal gratitude for such sympathetic and disinterested goodness. At his hospitable board, I have met many individuals, whose minds must ever be filled (as mine is) with the most exalted opinion of the excellence of his heart, and a high admiration of his anxious, noble, and generous efforts to soften the sufferings of the distressed, and to protect the interest and promote the welfare of every British subject.

It sometimes happens, and it may be the case with respect to Mr. S. Hancock, that the best motives and actions are misconceived and ill-received, where passion blinds the judgment. I will venture to assert, that a strict sense of duty, and a rigid regard to every sensation of justice, honour, and equity, have influenced Major Rochefort upon the occasion alluded to, as well as upon all others, since he has occupied the post he now holds at Ostend, although Mr. S. Hancock's opinion and feelings have led him to circulate a statement, which the general conduct, upright disposition, and long-established character of Major Rochefort are sufficient to falsify.—I am, Sir, your very humble servant, JOHN TUCKER.

P. S.—In expressing a just opinion of Major R., I feel that he will be more disposed to blame than to approve, what may be considered an "officious zeal;" but on this, as on most occasions, I follow the impulse of ardent and enthusiastic feelings, resulting from personal observation.

Be assured, that Major R. is not a common-place or ordinary character, and that few of this nation can justly boast of equal philanthropy, generosity, and disinterested zeal, with that which he possesses and puts in daily practice. J. G. F. T.

"Fait le droit
"A qui tu le dois."

CITY.

The Lord Mayor, Mr. Deputy WILLIAMS, of Cannon-street, Mr. THOMAS NATHANIEL WILLIAMS, and other Inhabitants of the Ward of Walbrook.—A considerable degree of ferment has for some time past prevailed in the City, of the particulars of which we have taken some pains to inform ourselves. Of the two Gentlemen named Williams, one, Mr. Deputy Williams, is *for*, and the other, Mr. Thomas Nathaniel Williams, is *against*, the Lord Mayor. The origin of the dispute occurred in 1817, when Mr. T. N. Williams first became a candidate to represent the

ward of Walbrook in Common Council: at this time he lost his election; but in a few months another contest took place, and he would have had a majority, but the other Members for this ward, eight in number, being averse from having him for a colleague, came to the poll, and he in consequence lost his election a second time by three votes. On last St. Thomas's day, however, he came in without opposition. The squabbles that arose during these three contests were numerous, and are likely to occupy the attention of our superior Courts; as a true bill of indictment was found on Thursday by the Grand Jury, against Mr. Deputy Williams, for a misdemeanour in refusing to produce the book of accounts of the said ward, pursuant to the Act of Parliament.

Mr. Thomas Nathaniel Williams is one of the four Attornies of the Lord Mayor's Courts; and during the contests and at a ward-mote, the Lord Mayor, then Mr. Alderman Atkins, presiding over the ward, observed, alluding to Mr. T. N. Williams, "You, Gentlemen, may elect this lawyer, if you please; I will never associate with him, or put my foot under the same table."

The Lord Mayor not wishing, it is supposed, to forfeit his word, and Mr. T. N. Williams being determined to support what he conceives to be his just right, the following warfare between them has been the result:—

It was so long since as 1806, that Mr. T. N. Williams purchased at a public sale, of the Corporation of London, for 2000 guineas and upwards, his place, and all the rights, fees, and advantages thereto belonging; and, among the rest, a privilege of a seat at the table of the Sword-bearer, in rotation with the three other attornies of that Court. His rotation commenced on Sunday, the 10th inst. and will continue till to-morrow, the 17th. On Monday last, the 11th, Mr. T. N. Williams accordingly presented himself: it happened to be Plough-Monday, which, at the Mansion-house, has always been considered a gala-day, when the household dine with the Lord Mayor and family in state, as a matter of course. Mr. Williams went to the Sword-bearer's room, and was soon informed that he would not be permitted to *dine* with the household, and that if he did persist in doing so, he would be turned out. Mr. Williams, however, considering himself entitled, as a matter of right, to a seat, went into the Lord Mayor's parlour, and took it at the table accordingly. The Lord Mayor soon afterwards entered, and having placed the Lady Mayoress in her seat, was proceeding to his own chair, when he discovered Mr. Williams not far from him; to whom he instantly walked up, and said, "Sir, you are not invited." He then called to his servants, exclaiming, "Turn him out! six of you, for I am master of this house, and I will be obeyed. Turn him out!" Any one can better conceive than we can describe, what now took place. It ended, however, in Mr. T. N. Williams being forcibly turned out; and, we are informed, the Lord Mayor assisted in this operation.

The next day (Tuesday) was also a regular dinner-day at the Sword-bearer's table; and at the appointed hour Mr. Williams came to the Mansion-house, and was informed by the porter at the gate that he was not to enter. He, however, took no notice, and passed on to the Sword-bearer's-room, where he soon received a message from Mr. Dixon, the house-steward, by Blakesby, a servant, that the Lord Mayor would not suffer him (Mr. Williams) to remain in the house. Mr. Williams, however, explained his right, and informed them, that he should of course dine there as usual, and then seated himself; upon which the Lord Mayor entered the room, with six or seven servants, and laid hold of Mr. Williams's arm, saying, "Servants, put him out immediately—do as I bid you at the peril of your places." Mr. Williams endeavoured to explain his right. The Lord Mayor answered, "I will abide by the consequences;" and Mr. Williams was again thrust out of the Mansion-house.

On the following day (Wednesday) Mr. Williams caused writs to be issued from the Court of King's-Bench, and served on the Lord Mayor and four of the servants who turned him out. The same day he again took his place at the Sword-bearer's table, when the Lord Mayor gave orders that no dinner should be served up while Mr. Williams was there. Mr. Williams however waited, and in about half an hour after the usual time of dinner, the Lord Mayor, with his servants, came into the room where Mr. Williams was, and addressed him thus:—"Sir, you have brought an action against me; that is enough to try the right; I am determined you shall not remain here, and you had better go quietly, one of my servants laying his hands on you." Mr. Williams answered, that he had been well advised, and that he should resist by force. The Lord Mayor replied, that he would send for peace-officers, and that he would order the dinner in another room where he, Mr. Williams, durst not enter. The Lord Mayor and Mr. Williams then entered into an altercation, which ended in his Lordship ordering Mr. Williams to be turned out a third time; and he was turned out accordingly, for which assault Mr. Williams has brought another action.

On Thursday Mr. Williams again went to the Mansion-house, being determined to take his seat at the Sword-bearer's table, notwithstanding what had passed, when he found every door locked against him.—On Friday, he applied to the Sitting Alderman at Guildhall for a *posse comitatus*, to enter the Mansion-house, which he still found locked against him.—The Alderman (Mr. CHRISTOPHER SMITH), however, considered it a question of such great importance, that he refused to do so, until he took the opinion of the Court of Aldermen.—A petition from the Ward of Walbrook has been presented to the Court of Aldermen, complaining that the present members of that ward are improperly returned by the Lord Mayor.—This question will come on next Tuesday.—*Times*.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH'S WILL.

The will of the late Lord Ellenborough is in substance as follows; the personal property is sworn under 200,000*l*.:—

He gives to Lady Ellenborough 1,260*l*. per annum, for her life, which, with the further sum of 140*l*. per annum, secured to her by marriage settlement, will make an annuity of 2,000*l*. to her for life. He also gives her all the household furniture and pictures in his house in St. James's-square, (except certain prints in his dressing-room, and some others afterwards mentioned) all his wines, household linen, wearing-apparel, and robes, (except as afterwards mentioned), all her own books, and one half of the plate. He directs the gold chain worn by him as Chief-Justice of England, to be offered in sale to his successor, as it was to him by direction of his predecessor, Lord Kenyon, at the sum of 100 guineas, the money to sink into the residue of his property.

He gives his gold watch and chain to his clerk, Mr. Richard Smith; and also 20*l*. for mourning, as a small mark of his remembrance of Mr. Smith's long and faithful services.

He gives to his eldest son, Edward, (now Lord Ellenborough,) all seals upon which his arms, &c. are engraved, and also his coat of arms, emblazoned by Sir Isaac Heard; he also gives him the remaining half of the plate, all the horses, cattle, live and dead stock, &c., at Roehampton, (except such as are used by Lady Ellenborough,) the remainder of the books, and all manuscripts and papers, a gold medal which he obtained as a prize at Cambridge; and the remainder of the pictures, particularly that of his father, by Romney; the Bishop of Elphin, by Robinson; the Bishop of Chester, by Hayter; Dr. Paley, by Romney; himself, by Lawrence, &c.; painting of poultry, supposed by Hondecoeter. He also gives to his eldest son his Peer's robes, and letters patent of the Peerage for life; directing them afterwards to accompany the title to his heirs male, as heir-looms, agreeably to a clause in the letters-patent. He gives to Lady Ellenborough 200*l*. for a present supply of cash at his death.

He gives to his dear natural daughter, Miss Elizabeth Thornton, 2,000*l*. with interest, from his death, to the time of payment.

He devises the Manor of Thorby-hall, and all his other hereditaments, to his son Edward, for life, with remainder to his heirs male; and on failure of issue, to his second son and his issue; and so on in succession to all his other sons and their issue, with remainder, on failure of issue of all of them, to his own right heirs. He grants a power to lease to each tenant for life, for any period not exceeding 21 years; and appoints the Puisne Judges of the Court of King's Bench and their heirs trustees, to support contingent remainders, &c.

He devises his estate at Roehampton, Surrey, purchased of the late Benjamin Goldsmid, Esq.'s trustees, with all the furniture, wines, live and dead stock, farming implements, &c. to his son Edward, and 2,000*l*. in money.

He directs the house in St. James's-square, with such furniture as is fitted to it, to be sold, and gives the proceeds, with all his remaining personal estate, to be equally divided amongst his nine younger children, and such others as might be afterwards born in his life time, or with which Lady Ellenborough might be enciente at his death, on their attaining 21 years of age, or being married, with benefit of survivorship as usual.

He requests Lady Ellenborough to execute the power of appointment necessary under their marriage-settlement, for giving effect to the provision thus made for the younger children; he

if any considerations should arise to make it advisable in her estimation not to do so, his Lordship expresses his wish not to limit their operation in her mind; but he leaves her, in that case, at liberty to decline executing the power of appointment.

He directs that Lady Ellenborough shall be paid a suitable sum for the maintenance of such of the younger children as shall remain with her, out of their respective fortunes, at the discretion of his executors, Hugh Leycester, Esq., and his brother Ewan Law, Esq., with the advice of Lord Sidmouth, Chief-Justice Gibbs, and Mr. Sergeant Lens; whose decision he directs to be taken upon all differences that may arise under his will. In addition to the two executors just mentioned, his Lordship appoints Lady Ellenborough, his son Edward, and his nephew Edward Henry Lushington, Esq., his executors likewise; and he gives to all his executors, and to Lord Sidmouth, 50*l.* each, for their trouble in the discharge of the trusts confided to them.

He observes, that as it might be painful to Lady Ellenborough to be disturbed in removing from St. James's-square immediately on his decease, he directs that she shall be permitted to remain there, with a suitable allowance for housekeeping, for one month afterwards.

He appoints her guardian of all his younger children.

He directs his funeral to be as plain and economical as possible.

He gives mourning rings to the Lord-Chancellor, Vice-Chancellor, Master of the Rolls, his successor, and all his brother Judges, the Attorney and Solicitor-General, Lord Sidmouth, Mr. Nathaniel Bond, the Bishop of Chester, and to his executors before-mentioned.

The will is dated on the 20th of March, 1817. It is re-published on the 8th of June following, in order to pass lands subsequently purchased at Shipley, in Northumberland; and again on the 21st of August following, to pass lands at Oakley-green, Bucks, since acquired by conveyance from Lady Ellenborough. There is also a codicil, dated May 11, 1818, by which his Lordship directs, that in case the shares of his younger children should exceed 10,000*l.* each, his eldest son Edward is to participate with them in the surplus; but this his Lordship says he does not consider likely to happen, at all events until after Lady Ellenborough's death; when the property apropriated to make good her annuity will revert again to his Lordship's estate.

The will and codicil are proved by all the executors except Mr. Ewan Law, to whom a power is reserved of doing so, if he should think proper, at any time hereafter.

The will and codicils are all in his Lordship's own hand-writing, and they are attested by his tipstaff and two servants. The hand-writing is much less neat and legible than in general it used to be, and the papers have the appearance of having been written in illness or in great haste. The devises of the real estates are expressed with as much brevity as is strictly consistent with their being legally operative; and they conclude with a clause stating his Lordship's wish to avoid prolixity, and his desire that the several devises shall operate agreeably to his meaning, in as complete a manner as if more formally expressed.

EXECUTION OF JOHNSTON.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICIARY.—On Thursday week the Court met. The LORD JUSTICE-CLERK addressed the Lord Advocate, stating, that the Court had heard with horror the shocking and disgraceful procedure which had taken place on the streets of this city on Wednesday the 30th of December last, on the occasion of the execution of Robert Johnston. The Court, before they felt themselves disposed to interfere, wished to know what was the result of any investigation his Lordship had instituted in consequence.

The LORD ADVOCATE stated, that having heard of the proceeding, next morning he had ordered the Procurator-Fiscal to apply to the Sheriff of the county to investigate minutely into the whole circumstances, and that investigation was going on, although not yet so complete as to enable him to lay it before the Court. He had also applied to the Magistrates of Edinburgh for a statement of the proceedings, which had been furnished, but was not complete to be laid before the Court. His Lordship said he agreed entirely with the Court as to the shocking and disgraceful procedure which had taken place, upon reading the account of which, in the public prints, he was very much hurt indeed. His Lordship, however, was happy to state, that the Magistrates of Edinburgh had no concern with the step which was taken to bleed the unfortunate man—none of the Magistrates were present upon the occasion; and the person who did so, with the view of ascertaining whether he was dead or alive, received no orders to do so from any of the Magistrates. His Lordship took this public opportunity of stating this, and assured their Lordships, that every information should be laid before them.

The LORD JUSTICE-CLERK.—The Court certainly expects, my Lord Advocate, the fullest investigation on this painful subject.—*Edinburgh Star.*

"Strong doubts, we understand, are entertained as to the propriety or legality of the second hanging, not because Johnston was not fairly and justly, according to the existing laws, condemned to suffer death, but because an attempt had, in the interim, been made to reanimate his half dead body, and because he had been exposed to suffering and torture not contemplated by the law. The *bleeding*, though humanely intended on the part of the surgeon, was, considering that a second hanging took place, as far as regarded Johnston, a barbarous, cruel, and, we presume, also an illegal species of torture. Nor is it enough to say that it was not *ordered*. It must also be shewn *why it was not officially prevented*, and why there was no Magistrate present to countermand it. We think the Magistrates would have done better, if, after the attempts at resuscitation were known, they had delayed proceeding farther until they had obtained a new warrant from the Justiciary Court. The doubt which must surely have suggested itself, as to the legality of suspending the culprit a second time, would have been sufficient to protect them in thus leaning to the side of mercy."—*Scotsman.*

LAW.

COURT OF KING'S BENCH.

Saturday week, a case was tried in the Court of King's Bench, which respected the liability of Surveyors to make good the injury sustained by any person in consequence of erroneous estimates. A lady had applied to a gentleman of property to purchase an annuity of her, and offered as a security an estate in Lincolnshire, which was then let to a tenant paying nominally 172*l.* per annum. The gentleman employed the Surveyor to survey this estate, and his report being that it was worth the rent, the annuity was bought. It seems, however, that there was a sort of conspiracy between the lady and her tenant, the estate not being really worth more than 48*l.* The tenant quitted the farm and went abroad, and the lady went to prison. The action was therefore brought to recover damages from the Surveyor, and though the latter was acquitted by all parties of any improper design, the Jury found a verdict for the plaintiff—Damages, 600*l.*—The Judge, in his charge, said, that any persons professing to exercise a calling must take the consequences of their negligence or incapacity.

ADMIRALTY SESSIONS.

On Monday, *James Clements* and *John Drake* were arraigned for the wilful murder of John M'Ardle on the 28th of April, 1817, on board the convict ship Chapman, in which Drake was commander, and Clements a marine. The evidence against the prisoners consisted of three convicts and two of the marines; and from their statements it appeared, that a disturbance took place on board the ship on the 17th of April, and the soldiers fired among the convicts on the supposition that they were going to murder them and run away with the ship. This happened again on the 28th, when M'Ardle was shot in his bed. The convicts contradicted each other very much. They denied that any attempt was made by the convicts to get possession of the ship; but it appeared from their admissions and the evidence of the soldiers, that there had been some threats thrown out by the malefactors some days before, that many of them had broken their irons, and that on the night in question they had forced the bulk-head and intended to rush on deck in two places at once. There was no particular circumstance against Drake, and the only thing against Clements was a declaration of one of the convicts that he had conspired with an officer to shoot them.—The Jury said, when the evidence for the prosecution was concluded, that there was no occasion to put the prisoners on their defence, and they were therfore acquitted.

Thomas Macdonald was convicted of a most brutal assault on Helen Breck, a female child of ten years of age, with intent to commit a rape. The girl was returning from Malta with her

father, in his Majesty's sloop the Myrmidon, in October last, when the prisoner availed himself of the opportunity of her being in bed, but was prevented from accomplishing his purpose. The girl has since been suffering extremely from a disease communicated to her on the occasion.—He was sentenced to two years imprisonment.

On Tuesday, *John Drake*, *Alexander Dewar*, and *Christopher Bustead*, were indicted for the murder of Daniel M'Cormick on board the ship Chapman, on the 17th April, 1817. Dewar was the surgeon and Bustead the lieutenant of the ship. The circumstances were similar to those of the case tried on the previous day; as it appeared that the conduct of the convicts was such as to justify the firing of the soldiers, the prisoners were acquitted.

POLICE.

GUILDHALL.

A lamentable instance of the effects of infatuation and enthusiasm was exhited at this office on Wednesday. *Samuel Sibley* and *Maria Catherine Sibley* his wife, *Samuel Jones* and his son, a boy of ten years old, *Thomas Jones*, *John Angel*, *Thomas Smith*, *James Dodd*, and *Edward Slater*, a boy of 12 years of age, were brought up from the Compter, by Beaton and Gibbon, who had with great difficulty rescued the prisoners from the fury of an immense mob, in Budge-row, about ten o'clock on Wednesday morning.—These deluded people were disciples of the late Joanna Southcott, and conceived themselves directed by God to proclaim the coming of the Shiloh on earth: for this purpose they assembled at the west end of the town, in order to enter the only gate of the great city (Temple-bar), through which they marched in procession about nine o'clock in the morning; they were each decorated with a white cockade, and wore a small star of yellow riband on their left breasts; Sibley led the procession, bearing a brazen trumpet adorned with light blue ribands, and the boys carried each a small flag of blue silk. In this manner they proceeded through Fleet-street, up Ludgate-hill, and along St. Paul's Church-yard, to Budge-row, a great crowd following them. Having arrived, as they supposed, in the middle of the great city, they halted, and began to perform their ceremonies. Sibley sounded the trumpet, and proclaimed the second coming of the Shiloh, the Prince of Peace, on earth; and his wife cried out aloud, "Wo! wo! to the inhabitants of the earth, because of the coming of the Shiloh." This cry was repeated several times, and joined in with a loud voice by the others in company. The crowd was by this time immense, every avenue was stopped up, and the passage of carts and carriages rendered impossible. The mob began with laughter and shouting, and at length proceeded to pelt with every sort of missile they could procure:—the followers of the Prophetess being most of them stout young men, resisted; the fight became tremendous; flags were torn down, and Sibley and his associates with great difficulty were preserved, by the exertions of the officers, from falling victims to the rage of the mob, and conveyed to the Compter. Their appearance, when put to the bar, bespoke the dangers they had gone through; the men had all been rolled in the mud, and Sibley bore evident marks of violence in his face.—When asked to give an account of their conduct, Sibley, with an air of authority, addressing the Alderman, said, he regretted there was not time for him to enter into the particulars of the mission of God to him. He had been commanded by a voice, through the boy, Slater, to announce that the Prince of Peace was come upon earth. He was commanded to proclaim the second coming of Shiloh, in the same manner, and with the same authority, as John the Baptist had proclaimed his first coming. This proclamation he was to make three times in the midst of the great city, by the sound of the trumpet. He and his companions were obeying the commands of God, and in so doing had conducted themselves peaceably, and interfered with no one, when they were attacked by the mob.—He was proceeding to explain the nature of the visions with which the boy had been favoured, and his wife was raising her voice to bear testimony to the fact of the Shiloh being on earth, whom she said she had had in her arms four times, when the MAGISTRATE interrupted them, and observed, that it was evident, if they were not insane, that they were acting under a strong delusion, and pointed out to them how much better they would have been employed in pursuing their regular avocations, than in being the cause of public riot, and endangering their own persons, recommending them to desist from any repetitions of their gross absurdities and delusions.—The men in reply said, it was right they should obey God; but they would do whatever the Magistrates directed, and desist from any further proclamation, assuring him at the same time that nevertheless the Shiloh was come.—The ALDERMAN said he would not rely on their promise, and should detain them all in custody till they could procure him some better assurance than their own words for their peaceable demeanour in future. They were accordingly conveyed back to the Compter in two coaches to protect them from the mob; one of the men on stepping into the coach unbuttoned his coat, displayed his yellow star; and placing his hand on it, proclaimed aloud that it was God's colour.—The male prisoners are journeymen mechanics, and appeared to be simple, deluded, but peaceable men. Sibley, the leader, is a watchman in Coleman-street ward.

On Thursday, *Samuel Sibley*, his wife, and the other poor deluded men and children, were again brought up before the sitting Magistrate.—Sibley was again the spokesman, and, in reply to the Magistrate, who inquired if he had ever been in Bedlam, said, the gentlemen might laugh, but he was not mad, but had *vestigated* the business thoroughly before he was convinced. He believed the Bible from cover to cover, and could point out the prophesies which were now fulfilling. He then went into a long rhapsody respecting the visions with which the boy had been favoured by God, and declared he had witnessed miracles performed by him. In the course of his long address, he quoted the Scriptures very fluently, and concluded by referring, in justification of his belief, to the passage in which it is said, "in the latter days your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men see visions." Being asked what place of worship he attended, he replied, his church was his own house, 3, Gooch-yard, Upper Whitecross-street; there were about 30 of them who met there frequently, to read the Bible and receive the commands of the Lord. He had now received command from God to desist from any further proclamation; and if the Prince Regent were to collect all the money in the world, and lay it at his feet, he dared not do it; the Magistrate might therefore rely there would be no repetition of their previous conduct. In this declaration he was joined by his wife and the rest of his associates, who all declared aloud, that they dared not now proceed any further in this business. On this assurance on their parts, they were discharged with a suitable admonition from the worthy Alderman.

BOW-STREET.

On Tuesday the Earl and Countess of Morton attended to exhibit a complaint against *Robert Grierson*, from whom the Countess had received two threatening letters, to extort money.—The Countess of Morton stated, that last Saturday she received a letter by the twopenny post, signed "Robert Grierson;" and on Monday evening she received another signed "Robert Grierson." From the threatening language used she considered herself to be in great danger from the prisoner.—The MAGISTRATE called upon Grierson to know what he had to say in answer to sending such letters; to which he replied, he could not give any answer to them, except he saw and examined them to enable him to say whether he wrote them or not. The Magistrate, however did not allow him to have the letters in his hands, and thereby give him an opportunity of destroying the written evidence against him, but read them aloud. The first was dated from the Turk's Head, Ratcliffe-cross. It stated that he was about to publish an Heroic Poem, in which he should introduce some unpleasant circumstance in which her late father, Sir Francis Buller, was engaged, at the Isle of Man, which would be injurious to his character; but if 100*l.* was sent to him, he would suppress the publication. The second and last letter was also dated from the Turk's Head, Ratcliffe-cross, Ratcliffe-highway; in which he enclosed a specimen of the poem relative to the character of the late Sir Francis Buller, and again urging for a draft for 100*l.* to be sent him, using violent threatening language if his demand was not complied with; and concluded by advising the Countess "to recollect and keep in mind, that there had been a Bellingham, and that there now was a Grierson." After the Magistrate had finished reading the letters the Prisoner was again asked what he had to say for himself; when he coolly admitted them to be his writing, and avowed the sentiments contained in them.—He was then ordered to be commited to the New Prison, Clerkenwell. The prisoner was understood to have acted some years since as a surgeon in the Isle of Man, but is now reduced.

HATTON-GARDEN.

On Tuesday evening, John Limbrick, of this office, apprehended the supposed mother of the child dropped in Tash-street, (on whom a Coroner's Inquest has since been held in the Workhouse, in Little Gray's-inn-lane, where it died,)

against whom, and *Ann Symons*, the midwife, a true bill was found on Monday at the Clerkenwell Sessions. Limbrick, the officer, accommodated the mother that night in his own house, she being ordered to give twenty-four hours' notice of bail. Tuesday night she was brought to the office, where she gave bail, herself in 200*l.* and two sureties in 100*l.* each. The case was managed with so much secrecy that no person in the office knew any thing of the affair: the gentlemen who were accepted as bail having first come in, and given their names and address to the clerk, returned again with the lady, who, the better to conceal herself, was dressed rather below her usual style. She wore black, with a thin threadbare red cloak thrown over her; a white straw bonnet, with ribands, and a bunch of artificial flowers, with a thick black veil. She stepped up with her two bail to the clerk, and in a low tone of voice merely consented to the terms of bail read in a very low voice by the clerk, and then left the office unnoticed. She never raised her veil, or looked up; but from a passing glimpse, her face appeared pleasing: her age about 32.

ACCIDENTS, OFFENCES, &c.

Execution.—On Tuesday morning, at 12 minutes after eight o'clock, the three criminals, *Knight*, *Morris*, and *Tingay*, who were capitally convicted in October sessions, underwent the sentence of the law opposite Newgate, in the presence of a great crowd. Wm. Knight, who was not more than 17 years of age, was tried for a highway robbery and convicted. Morris was a watchman of Camden-town, and in conjunction with the servants of Edward Clulow, Esq., robbed the house of a great quantity of plate. Tingay, *alias* Cripps, was convicted for stealing three heifers. The Rev. Mr. Cotton administered the Sacrament to them. When the unhappy men ascended the scaffold they were remarkably penitent; but the ed Knight declared, that although he had led a most dissolute and profligate life, he was innocent of the crime for which he was about to suffer.—After praying a few moments on the scaffold, he ejaculated—"*I am innocent! I am innocent! You see an innocent man suffer!*" He then requested that a handkerchief might be tied over his eyes, which being done, the fatal signal was given, and the unfortunate malefactors were plunged into eternity, and died almost without a struggle.

Hydrophobia.—A third victim has fallen to the mysterious malady called hydrophobia. About five weeks ago, it was mentioned that a child, nine years of age, residing at the Perth Road, had been bitten on the cheek by a dog, and that the bite had been removed by a surgeon. "Seventy hours (says a respectable correspondent) had elapsed from the time of the bite before the excision was accomplished. The recent wound made by the knife was constantly bathed with tepid water, for a full hour, and an emolient poultice was applied over it. Next day the wound was washed with oxymuriatic acid (liquid chlorine), and its edges drawn together by adhesive straps, with a view to make the cicatrix as neat as possible. Two days after, a complete adhesion of the edges of the wound had taken place. The girl took laxatives and thirty drops of liquid chlorine three times a-day. At first, there was more swelling in the face than was to be expected from an ordinary wound of much larger dimensions; after the excision, the pain and swelling rapidly abated, and soon ceased. About a week after the wound was healed, the cicatrix was destroyed by lunar caustic, and the eschar allowed to fall off spontaneously. The girl continued apparently well and playful. It was observed, however, that her sleep was disturbed; which excited the apprehensions of her medical attendant. On Saturday morning last, on attempting to swallow tea, the characteristic symptoms of hydrophobia manifested themselves; pain was felt in the wound, and in the side of the head. The symptoms increased with occasional remissions, and one complete intermission of about two hours, until Tuesday morning at eight o'clock, when she died. In this case, neither imagination nor the medicine employed can be charged with having thwarted the natural course of the disease. Those who have seen all the cases which have occurred here lately, have been struck with the exact similarity of the symptoms, notwithstanding the diversity of rank, age, and treatment;—a circumstance which, while it shows most distinctly the specific nature of the disease, also shows how lamentably distant we are from any thing like a cure; and that the malady, when once established, cannot even be made to bend from its natural course by the most powerful applications."—*Dundee Advertiser, Jan.* 8.

On Friday, *Alfred Rabenhill*, aged four years, the son of Mr. R. of Charles-street, Clerkenwell, being left alone in an apartment, in which there was a fire, by some unfortunate circumstance his clothes caught fire, and he was burnt in such a deplorable manner, before assistance arrived, as to cause his death in a few hours.

Last week a woman at Paris, who was in the habit of drinking brandy to excess, was found by her husband on his return home, at the point of death. She died almost immediately, and on examination was found to be much burnt, although there was neither fire nor candle in the apartment. The physicians who were consulted were of opinion, according to the Paris journals, that the accident arose from spontaneous combustion.

MARRIAGES.

On the 28th of Dec. Miss Charlotte Normansell, of Gloucester-street, Portman-square, to J. Woolfryes, Esq. of Salisbury.

On the 7th instant, at Yarmouth, Fuller Farr, Esq., of Lombard-street, to Miss Lacon, daughter of Sir Edm. Lacon Bart.

On the 7th inst., at Littleham, Devon, Charles Gifford, Esq., of Parker's-well-house, Exeter, to Mary, eldest daughter of Fairfax Moresby, Esq., of Staffordshire.

On the 9th inst., at Hampstead, John Spencer, Esq., of Ballanger, Bucks, to Julia, only daughter of the late James Lawrence, M.D.

At the Municipality, Paris, Miss Hammet, daughter of the late Sir Benjamin Hammet, of Lombard-street, to Monsieur Henry Montesquieu.

On the 13th inst., at Stoke-Rochford, Frederick, the eldest son of Wm. Manning, Esq. M.P., of Combe-Bank, Kent, to Elizabeth Edmunda, eldest daughter of Edmund Turner, Esq., of Stoke-Rochford, Lincoln.

On Thursday, at Highnam-court, Gloucestershire, Robert Harvey, Esq., eldest son of Sir Robert Bateson Harvey, Bart. of Langley-park, Bucks, to Jemima Jane, only daughter of the late John Raw Collins, Esq. of Hatch-court, Somerset.

Friday, at St. Pancras Church, Matthew Holmes, Esq. of Great Queen-street, Westminster, to Miss Eleanor Holmes, of Brunswick-square.

DEATHS.

On the 4th inst. Lord Hartland. His Lordship was married, in 1765, to the Hon. Catherine Moore, daughter of Lord Mount-Cashel, and is survived by her Ladyship, by whom he has left issue, Major General Thomas Mahon, now Lord Hartland; Major-General Stephen Mahon; and the Rev. Maurice Mahon, one of the Prebendaries of St. Patrick's Cathedral.

On Friday week, at Melbury House, in Dorsetshire, the Countess of Ilchester.

On Sunday, at Paris, after a long and painful illness, the Count de Beauharnais. He was the son of Madame de Beauharpais, well known for her different amusing literary productions, and was cousin of the Empress Josephine.

On the 6th inst., of a typhus fever, Richard Langley, fourth son of Marmaduke Dayrell, Esq., of Camps, Cambridge.

On the 4th inst., at his house at Islington, in his 70th year, Samuel Charrington, Esq.

On Thursday week, in Gower-street, in his 36th year, the Rev. Dr. William Morice, Rector of All-hallows, Bread-street.

On Wednesday, in a fit of apoplexy, while transacting business at the West-India Dock-house, Mr. Kenrish, of Cornhill.

Dr. John Wolcot, so well known in the literary world under the name of PETER PINDAR, on Wednesday night, at his apartments in Somers-town, after a lingering illness, which confined him to his bed, in the 81st year of his age.

On Friday, E. H. Seymour, Esq., who was many years upon the provincial stage. He was the author of "Remarks, Critical, Conjectural and Explanatory, on the Plays of Shakespeare."

At Woodhouse, in Scotland, on the 19th December, Mrs. Ballantine, of Sunnyacres, in her ninety-ninth year. She has left alive 6 children, 27 grandchildren, 44 great-grandchildren; and has buried 1 child, 20 grandchildren, and 4 great-grandchildren. The number of her remaining descendants is 77; and, including the deceased, they amount to 102.

Marguerite Reinaud, lately, at Toulouse, at the age of 117 years. She was born in 1701, was married in 1721, and became a widow in 1735. She has lived free from infirmities, and preserved to the last moment the full use of her faculties. Her principal occupation was spinning at a distaff, which she continued until the day before her death.

Printed and published by JOHN HUNT, at the EXAMINER-Office 19, Catherine-Street, Strand.—Price 10*d.*